324.3
OK4w
1918

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA BULLETIN

New Series No. 153. University Extension Series No. 40

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA BULLETIN

WOMAN SUFFRAGE

NORMAN, OKLAHOMA
APRIL 15, 1918

University of Oklahoma Bulletin, published by the university, is issued semi-monthly. Entered at the postoffice at Norman, as second class matter, under act of congress of August 24, 1912. Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage, provided for in Section 1103, act of October 3rd, 1917, authorized on July 8th, 1918.

The person charging this material is responsible for its return to the library from which it was withdrawn on or before the **Latest Date** stamped below.

Theft, mutilation, and underlining of books are reasons for disciplinary action and may result in dismissal from the University.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

JUN 10 1973

MAY 26 1973

L161—O-1096

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY

JAN 17 1919

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

THE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC DISCUSSION AND DEBATE

WOMAN SUFFRAGE

J. W. SCROGGS, EDITOR

Resolvd: That women should be granted equal suffrage with men.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY BY THE UNIVERSITY
NORMAN, OKLAHOMA.

324.3
Ok4w
1918

10 Sp 21 LAP

FOREWORD

A debate bulletin on Woman Suffrage was issued a few years ago, but the edition is now exhausted. Insted of reprinting that, practically a new bulletin has been made. Acknowledgements are due to the national organizations for and against Woman Suffrage, and especially to Miss Marjorie Shuler, secretary of the Oklahoma organization in favor of Woman Suffrage; and to Miss Maybelle Stuard, Secretary of the Oklahoma organization opposing Woman Suffrage.

Again it is urged that debating a question only once is of little value from any standpoint. Where the sole motive is to win we are training the debaters in insincerity, and tempting them to use the trickery of debate; they miss the training in the expression of honest conviction and endeavor to convince.

It is best to begin with a formal debate, where the speakers are assigned sides; this introduces the subject only. At the close of the formal debate the presiding officer should ask all who would like to speak on the subject to write their names on slips of paper with the side they will espouse, affirmative or negative. These should be given to the program committee who can arrange a program for the next meeting in which each speaker will speak his real convictions, will discuss the merits of the question, and will try to convince his audience. This will make real debating.

At the close of each debate, except the introductory or formal debate, a vote should be taken, first of qualified voters, and then of the entire audience. If these votes are reported to the University Extension they will be publisht at the end of the school year.

As in all other debate bulletins, the University assumes, of course, no responsibility for any opinions expresst; the sole purpose is to place more material for effective debate in reach of the young people of the state. The main purpose of the editor is to give each side an equal chance to win.

Norman, Okla., Sept., 1918. J. W. Scroggs, Editor.

cont.

12 M 19 directy

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Alternates

https://archive.org/details/womansuffrage00univ

WOMAN SUFFRAGE

WOMEN SHOULD MIND THEIR OWN BUSINESS

By Edward J. Ward, adviser of the Civic and Social Center Development of the University of Wisconsin.

Women should devote all their energies to the duties of their own sphere. Surely Mrs. Pankhurst and Colonel Roosevelt could agree on this proposition.

Women should not invade the realm of man's activities. That seems axiomatic. Men should be willing to give up their own work to help the burdens which belong to women's realm, What gentleman will dissent from this?

In order to see clearly what the proper respective spheres of men and women are, we must turn back to the simple conditions of primitive living, among the American aborgines for instance. There we see two sorts of work fairly well divided. We can see woman engaged in her proper sphere, and man busy with his characteristic activities. And we can answer the question: What is woman's sphere? The woman is engagd in grinding corn or other grain, preparing food, plaiting baskets, molding pottery, preparing wool, and weaving blankets, drawing and fetching water, caring for and educating the children, ordering the care of the camp or village, transporting the burdens when the camp is moved—in short, in all the useful industries and arts of the primitive Indian.

And what was man's characteristic sphere? War and killing other animals, with some minor avocations such as gambling between times—but mostly war. Here we have the respective spheres of men and women, easily seen in simple primitive division.

With the process of invention and discovery there have come great changes in the methods used to carry on the activities of women's sphere, for instance, instead of the little stone hand mortar and pestle with which the primitive woman ground corn, we have the gigantic roller mills; instead of the earthen jar in which she carried water, we have the municipal water system; instead of the primitive methods by which she transported

burdens, we have this work of hers done by means of freight and express trains and vans and automobiles, and so on through practically all of the lines of women's sphere. There has been an equally great enlargement of work which was hers in caring for, keeping well-ordered, clean and comfortable the camp or village; with the increasing aggregation of people into the modern city and State, this phase of woman's work has grown tremendously.

And great changes have come also in the proper historic sphere of men's activities. Instead of the simple bow and arrow or tomahawk with which the primitive man could hurt people, there have been developed artificial volcanoes and various forms of hardware and fireworks which are very much more harmful, expensive and noisy. Slaughter houses have been substituted for the hunt, except in the case of really dangerous wild beasts like the fly. Not much real improvement has, however, been made in the methods of gambling.

Women should remain in their own sphere. They should devote themselves to useful civic, social, educational and industrial activities, For women to participate in carrying on the activities which belong to man's particular province would mean for them to go to war, and when there isn't a war on, to strut around with a band. This, it seems to me, they should not do.

On the other hand, men should continue to devote more and more of their thought and energy to the activities of woman's proper sphere, the useful work of the world, the industries and the arts, the work of transportation, the cleaning up and making comfortable of the living places. Men must be allowed to do this more and more, for though we still set apart from this useful service some of our number and support them to carry on the work of destruction and hurting strangers, yet this proper sphere of man's activities for the majority of us isn't what it used to be. The average male individual has given up wearing feathers and stovelids and tinware, and the average man no longer regards it as a sign of sanity to carry butcher knives and other violent junk around with him in the hope of chopping his neighbor's head open. That is, men have been turning away from their own particular vocation, and, if they didn't enter woman's sphere of constructive service, there wouldn't be much for them to do.

In the old days, when man's sphere amounted to something, when practically all of them spent most of their time in war, government consisted of "councils of war" for devising methods of doing harm. Then government was man's business and for women to participate in it would have been to take up the work of

men. But as we have come away from barbarism, as this sphere of man's activity has shrunken and fallen into disrepute, government has become more and more the organization and control of the means of human service, the promotion of human welfare. In other words, government has become more and more the organization of woman's sphere.

Man should have a voice in this, for in spite ofthe age-old habit of selfishness and hostility, developt through thousands of years of practice in hurting people, which tends to make him carry on even the useful activities which belong to woman's sphere with something of the war motive and manner, and with a good deal of the old gambling practice mixed in, and which makes it hard for him to think in terms of common welfare, he is the child of his mother and has in him a finer element, a latent capacity for constructive united service. Yes, men should have some voice in regulating and controlling the industries, the education of children and all the matters relating to the welfare of the camp, that is, of society.

But of course the fact that man participates does not limit the primary responsibility of woman in this sphere. She started this business of human service. She can no more shirk her share in the ordering and control of society, in the mutual interservice which we call government, without shirking her duty as a woman than in the old days she could shirk the duty of preparing the food and making the camp a pleasant, well ordered, clean place in which to live.

Women then should mind their own business. That is, women should vote in the modern government, for this is their proper sphere except in its destructive, anti-social, military expression, which has gone from local and city and State affairs and will be gone from national affairs as soon as we get sense enough to put through a few world bargains such as the neutralization of the Panama Canal, and international parliament with an with an international police force establisht at The Hague.

And men ought also to vote in the modern government, in spite of the fact that this is woman's sphere, because—well, because any number of reasons—they pay taxes the same as women do and they should have a voice in saying how their money shall be spent; they have to submit to the laws just as women do, and they should have something to say in framing those laws; and anyway, it would not be honest for us to have a government by a sex when we pretend to have a democracy.

WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES IT MAKE TO THE WOMEN

By Ellis Meredith,

From the Pictorial Review.

There are millions of women who are indifferent to voting; some of them are violently opposed to it. But there are no women who do not want certain rights which are matters of legislation No matter how much a woman loves and respects her husband, she wishes to be legal guardian of her children if she is left a widow.

The year that equal suffrage was pending in Colorado, a woman came into headquarters and told her story, in the hope that it might awaken other women to some of the limitations under which most women still labor. Briefly the facts were these: Her husband had died, leaving her three children and a large fortune. The Court decided that it was too large a fortune for a woman to manage and appointed a guardian. Soon after the mother took the children to Philadelphia and put them in school there. The guardian wrote her that the oldest girl, who was then sixteen, must return to his home in New Mexico. The mother objected and there were telegrams and letters; but the girl was finally sent West, her mother remaining with the youngest daughter, who was desperately ill. . . . . As soon as she could leave she went to New Mexico, where she found that her sixteen year-old daughter had been married to the son of her guardian. The law was on his side.

About a year before this time a young couple came to Colorado in the quest of health for the husband. His wife nursed him devotedly; but he died. Three months later a baby was born, and when it was a few months old his people came to Denver and took the child home. The father had willed away his unborn child and the mother was powerless.

These two instances of legal right, so wrong as to outrage every human emotion, did much to enfranchise the woman of Colorado. No bill was ever passed with such record speed as the one which made women coequal guardians of their children in Colorado. This is the law now in twenty states and the District of Columbia. "In all the other states and territories," says Ellen Spencer Mussey, Dean of the Washington College of Law, "the father is preferred as guardian. In eight states the father has the right to name by will the guardian of a minor child, even during

the mother's life. In some of these states, it is expressly provided that an unborn child can be so disposed of."

Men are so much better than some of the laws they have made in the past that it takes some glaring injustices to get these laws changed. Massachusetts did not pass a coequal guardianship law until after the Naramore tragedy, when a distracted mother murdered her six children and attempted suicide after the father's threat to take them from her. It took fifty-five years of effort and six murders to make Massachusetts enact a law that Colorado women saw put upon the statutes the first session of the legislature after their enfranchisement.

There are wide differences in the inheritance laws as they apply to men and women. In one state, for example, "All earnings of husband and wife are common property; but the husband controls it as long as he lives and may will half of it away. The wife has nothing to say about it while he lives, cannot will it away, and only inherits half in the case of his death, whereas he inherits it all in the case of her death."

In Colorado, when the probate laws were codified, parents were made equal heirs. Then the committee having the bill in charge went a step further. In the case of the death of a married daughter, her husband is the heir and under the old law, in case of his death, the property would have reverted to His father. Now, it is divided evenly between the four surviving parents.

The government is much concerned about the cotton-boll worm, chinch-bugs, codling moths, apple borers, hog cholera, moths, locusts and grasshoppers. But when the United States Commissioner of Education asked for an appropriation of $3,000 to study certain conditions of child life, he was greeted with laughter, even while the appropriation committee handed over $15,000 for the scientific study of clams, the object being to teach clams to produce better shells for making pearl buttons. Under the circumstances, who wouldn't be a clam?

Twelve firms in Chicago were fined the minimum sum, five dollars, for breaking the child labor law, and the same day the same judge gave a man the minimum fine, fifteen dollars, for having in his possession a bottle of ginger ale with an illegal label.

Not long ago the Indiana legislature appropriated $15,000 at the request of the fruit growers and bee keepers, but refused $2,000 for the publication of circulars concerning the health and welfare of children.

In round numbers, there are about 20,000,000 children in

school in this country, about 17,000,000 of them being in the public schools, and twenty-five per cent of them are absent every day.

Besides these children there are some 600,000 who are absolutely illiterate. When a cotton mill is opened in the South only white labor is employed; so the little white child goes to the factory. To what end do we put the flag over the school house, if the child is in the factory?

Women haven't devoted as much time as men to the study of pests and blights; but they have discovered certain analogies between nature and human nature. The way to have sound apples is to kill the worm in the bud, and the way to have a bright and glorious manhood is to throw around children the sacred egis of government protection that is now extended to the pig-sty and the hen-coop threatened with an epidemic of pip.

Having learned what are their "rights," women are learning that the right way to obtain them is that set forth by Webster—the direct way, not by influencing somebody else and arriving at the desired goal indirectly. Above all, the woman who has a broad and intelligent interest in public affairs is learning even before she gets the ballot, that citizenship is a pearl of great price, and like other pearls it must be worn; it must come in contact with human life if it is to retain luster.

BOUNDARIES OF THE HOME

By Mary Alden Hopkins,

From the Congregationalist.

A woman keenly interested in the well-being of children, approacht a legislator to ask his support of a bill concerning medical examination of school children. The delicate susceptibility of the legislator was outraged by the unwomanliness of her "lobbying." He rebuked her sternely for meddling in politics, ending with the impressive words: "Madame, a good woman stays at home to take care of her children."

The woman withdrew, somewhat puzzled. The compulsory education law took her children out of her home to put them in a schoolroom, and too exalted idealism forbade her trying to influence school policies. As she thought about the matter, she decided that the puzzling contradiction lay in limiting "home" to the cubic space included between house and walls, cellar and

roof. It seemd to her that wherever her little childrn went she must go; that she must concern herself with all that toucht her children's interests; that her "home" was really the entire city—the state—the country—perhaps the whole world.

Here are two incidents that confirmd her in her decision:

The water supply of Fairholm was contaminated by the sewage from the towns up the river. Typhoid fever floated leisurely down with the current, pausing for its handful of lives from each town. The city council said decisively that the city could not build a filter plant without increast taxation. At the words "Increast taxation" the majority of the men assured their wives that the best method was to boil the water. They squelcht wifely discussion by remarks like, "My dear, if you want a new filter plant you must change our state constitution on the bonded indebtedness of third-class cities."

That sounded more like politics than like woman's concerns, and the housewives set to boiling. Mrs. Homer, among others, boild water to drink, water for bathing "above the neck," water for washing vegetables; and scalded her hands along with the dishes. She forbade the children's tasting water outside the house. Disobedient Jimmy on the baseball field drank water from a tin bucket—without getting the fever; Janet sipt dubious drinks at the ice-cream emporium—likewise without harm; while little Josie, despite hours of conscientious thirst, got the fever from milk in her own blue china mug. The cow's drinking water had not been boiled. The mothers of Fairholm had not attackt the source of danger, because of their narrow definition of "home."

Mrs. Roscoe canceld her subscription to a certain magazine because it containd too many articles on tragic conditions among city working women. Said Mrs. Roscoe: "if I bring up my own five children well in my own home I can be excused from worrying about sweatshops five hundred miles away." But the dinky little winter coat she bought for Bobby had sewd into its well finisht seams some slivers of scarlet-fever skin. The manufacturer had found it cheaper to send his work out into tenements for "finishing," and no city has adequate official inspection of tenement-house sweat shops.

Story after story could be told of food contaminated before it enterd the house; bread handled warm by a scrofulous baker; shiny red apples sold to school children by a vnder with a loathesome disease; food on which flies had trampt; and adulterated raw material. What does it profit a cook to fight vermin in her

own cellar if the state inspection of slaughter houses is lax, the bakeshops unsanitary and the street selling unsupervisd?

It is a mother's business to buy warm clothing, but the amount of wool in baby's 25-cent shirt is determind by the tariff. Nursery hygiene is written in "Schedule K."

More and more each year the initial processes of manufacturing food and clothes slip out of the hands of mothers into the hands of men whose first interest is money making. From yeast and soap to Ray's stockings and Dorothy's bon-bons, articles come ready-made into the house. Yet the children's welfare still depends upon the wholesomeness of their food and the warmth of their clothes.

What is the mother to do about it? Does her interest in the food begin only as it comes up the back steps? Has she no responsibility for fire-trap buildings, uncensord moving pictures, unkept parks and dirty streets, because these matters have movd into "politics"—are even election issues whereby candidates stand or fall?

Some mothers say that, since a new method of production has come about, mothers must learn to understand that method. They say that municipal housekeeping is not so very different from family housekeeping. They say that, after all, the nation is simply an overgrown family, and that, just as a complete family group must have both father and mother so the nation needs both father and mother care.

RELATION OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE TO WORKING WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

By Florence Kelley.

Never before in the history of the human race have children and young women formd, as they do today, an important part of the working force of great industrial communities wholly apart from their parents and the family life.

In the telephone and telegraph service something like a revolution would be causd if suddenly all the young people under the age of twenty-one were withdrawn. In retail trade the cash children, bundle girls, wrappers, and junior clerks are an extremely important part of the whole working force.

How long these young workers shall be employed in a day may be literally a matter of life and death for them. Within my

own acquaintances more than one young girl has died of pneumonia, rheumatism, or tuberculosis, due directly to overtime work with the accompanying exhaustion and loss of power to resist disease.

Now the health, morals and intelligence of the rising generation are peculiarly objects of solicitude to women. To deprive women of an equal share of power to determine the laws for these young workers is to give cruelly unequal power to sordid employers.

In manufacture, older men form a larger part of the total working force than in retail trade. And the older men are voters. Factory laws are obtained, therefore, with greater ease than workable laws for safeguarding the health and welfare of children and young girls.

A sinister chapter to which too little attention has hitherto been paid is the failure of our legislatures and courts to afford to young girls protection from seduction, assault, and enslavement in infamous houses. The difficulty involved in obtaining the conviction of malefactors is known only to the few faithful souls who have attempted to obtain due punishment of these grave offenses. Mothers in any community are more deeply stird by these offenses than by any others, but judges and juries vary beyond belief in their treatment of criminals guiity of crimes against girls.

In one Western state a woman worked fourteen years to obtain the enactment of a workable statute to punish crimes against female minors. At last such a law was passt and vigorously enforced. Fourteen criminals were sent to the penitentiary. Then a young lawyer offerd his services to one of the criminals to free him by showing that the law was unconstitutional, because the title should have read "to define and punish crimes against female minors"; whereas though in fact the two words "define and" were missing from the title, the necessary definition was contained in th body of the statute. Upon this frivolous ground the Supreme Court of the State held the statute invalid and nine of the fourteen criminals were forthwith freed. The remaining five were too poor or too ignorant to obtain counsel and remaind in the penitentiary. The patient woman whose work was thus frustrated continued the agitation. The legislature. after great effort on her part, re-enacted the statute with the title complete. But the nine criminals could not again be tried for the same offense, and remaind at liberty. It is hard to believe that such weary effort would be needed if the mothers and the

teachers were a part of the voting constituency upon whom judges and legislators depend for their political career.

It is the children of the poor who form the working contingent in retail trade. It is the daughters of the poor who chiefly fall victims to the basest crimes. Poor, young, ignorant, unorganized, they depend for protection upon laws framed and enforced by persons older than themselves. Is it safe or sane to exclude from the full share of power and responsibility the mothers and teachers, the older women whose first care is for the welfare of the young?

TURN ON THE LIGHT

From Circular, National Woman Suffrage Association.

Among thoughtful men there is very little difference of opinion as to the justice of woman suffrage, but there is much as to its expediency. It is asserted that the experiment of woman suffrage has not proved altogether successful in the West, especially in Colorado, and that it has not brought any great advantage. Is this so?

Has woman suffrage brought any material improvement in the government of states where it exists? Has it improved moral conditions, safeguarded the interests of the home, given better protection to children, improved conditions for working men and women and generally advanced the coming of better government?

This question must be answerd, not by opinions and theories but by facts.

Children Have a Better Chance for Life. A publication of the Children's Bureau at Washington in 1915 showd that the lowest infant death rate in the world was in New Zealand, where women had voted for twenty-two years, and where government aid and instruction is given to mothers, even in the remotest country districts.

In all of the seven countries which had the lowest infant death rates women have at least the municipal vote, and in two, Norway and Australia, they have full suffrage. According to the latest figures compiled by the New York Milk Committee, of all the cities in the United States with the lowest infant death rate the equal suffrage cities average 66 per 1,000, while the male suffrage cities average 100.7 per 1,000. Kansas has reduced its infant death rate from 120 to 70 since it established a

State Infant Hygiene Bureau, the first one in the United States, in 1913, the year after women were given full vote.

In view of these facts it seems to be shown conclusively that when women vote they are better able to attend to their business—the health of their children.

Children are Better Protected from Exploitation in Mills and Factories. Fewer children are employed in all of the twelve woman suffrage states put togther than in almost any one of the larger Eastern or Southern States. The total number of children at work in all occupations in the eleven equal suffrage states is 55,234. North Carolina alone has 144,632, that is, one male suffrage state alone has 89,398 more children at work than all the equal suffrage states put together. Mothers as voters are watching to see that the evil of child labor shall not get a foothold.

In 11 equal suffrage states boys, 10 to 15, at work, 11 per cent.

In 37 male suffrage states boys, 10 to 15, at work, 25.9 per cent.

In 11 equal suffrage states girls, 10 to 15, at work, 2 per cent.

In 37 male suffrage states girls, 10 to 15, at work, 12.7 per cent.

Owen Lovejoy, Secretary of the National Child Labor Committee says:

"It would not be surprising if the eleven suffrage states had no child labor laws of any consequence when it is considered how few children are employed. It is largely due to the urging of the women that in spite of the need not being so pressing, the laws of the equal suffrage states compare favorably even with those of the Eastern States, where the problem has been largest and has been fought most vigorously."

Six of the twelve states where men and women both vote have an eight hour working day for children under 16, but only 14 of the 36 states, where women do not vote, have such a law.

Public Institutions for Children and Girls Are Given More Attention. Women naturally have more sympathy and experience with children than men. In equal suffrage states it is customary to appoint women to boards of public institutions. In Colorado the State Home for Dependent Children must have women as two of its five members; at least three of the six members of the Board of County Visitors must be women, and three of the five members of the Board of the State Industrial

Home for Girls must be women. Yet many of the states where women do not vote will not allow women on any of the boards dealing with unfortunate girls.

Illiteracy Has Been Almost Abolisht. Every equal suffrage state has state-wide compulsory education. Five states where women are not allowd to vote still permit children to grow up absolutely illiterate. Th average percentage of illiteracy in the United States is 8.1 per cent; the average of all of the equal suffrage states, with the exception of Arizona, is 3.2 per cent. Even with Arizona included, which has a very high percentage of illiteracy, owing to its Mexican and Indian population, it is only 4.7 per cent. The eight states which have had woman suffrage the longest have an illiterate percentage of only 2.8 per cent. (U. S. census 1910, Table 10 p. 5)

Better Laws for Working Women. In many states men have won for themselves an eight-hour working day. The laws of twenty-three states limit the hours of men in public employ to eight. Women need this protection the same as men, but the only states where they have an eight-hour day are states where women vote, Arizona, California, Colorado, Washington, Nevada and in many occupations in Oregon.

In California the bill was passt by the same legislature that gave suffrage to women but was not signd by the governor until after the women were given the vote. In the state of Washington it was submitted to the legislature and defeated every year for eight years but was passt the year following the granting of the vote to women.

The worst hours of labor in equal suffrage states are the best in the male suffrage states. Nine hours, which is the New York State working day for women, have only been granted in nine out of the 36 states where women do not vote. The others allow ten, eleven and twelve, and in six of them there are no laws whatever to regulate the hours of work of women in industry. (American Association for Labor Legislation, Dec. 1916.)

Workmen's Compensation Laws. These laws exist in every equal suffrage state except Idaho and Utah, where there are few women in industry. There are 14 male suffrage states without this law. (American Association for Labor Legislation, Dec. 1916)

Industrial Welfare Commissions, the best form of determining living wages, exist in only ten of the United States, and six of these are in states where men and women both vote. (American Association for Labor Legislation, Dec. 1916).

Colorado, as a result of the terrible strike at Ludlow, has the only Industrial Disputes Law in the country, which protects the rights of the general public in an industrial dispute.

Equal Guardianship Laws, giving to both the father and mother the control of the children, exist in every state where men and women both vote, except Arizona. In twenty-one states where women do not vote the father is still the sole guardian of the child, and in three, Delaware, Florida and Tennessee, he can will or deed away the child from the mother.

Age of Consent laws are uniformly higher in states where women vote. Eighteen is the age in every equal suffrage state except Nevada and Oregon, where it is sixteen. In nine states where women do not vote a girl of fifteen, fourteen and twelve, and in one state a child of only ten years, can consent to her own ruin.

Widowed mothers' pension laws which give a widow left destitute with children a pension (the same sum or less that is usually given to the orphan asylum) which enables her to bring up her children at home, are in effect in every equal suffrage state but Arizona, where the law was declared unconstitutional in 1914 and has not yet come before the Supreme Court. Only eighteen of the thirty-six states where women do not vote have this law.

WHERE WOMEN VOTE

There are fifteen million women voters in the world, Abroad, women vote on the same terms as men in Norway, Sweden, Finland, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, Iceland, Denmark, England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales and Canada. In the United States, women vote on equal terms with men in Wyoming, Colorado, Idaho, Utah, Washington, Alaska, Montana, Nevada California, Arizona, Kansas, Oregon and New York.

Women have Presidential Suffrage in Illinois, North Dakota, Nebraska, Michigan, Rhode Island, and Indiana; primary suffrage in Arkansas and Texas; municipal suffrage in Vermont.

No state or country where women have actually voted has attempted to take the ballot away, a fact which proves that woman suffrage has in no way injurd women, men or the home nor harmed the community interests. On the contrary, prominent men and women of every profession, class and state have from their own knowledge testified that woman suffrage works well.

OPINIONS OF EMINENT PERSONS.

Abraham Lincoln: "I go for all sharing the privileges of the government who assist in bearing its burdens, by no means excluding women."

Theodore Roosevelt: "I believe in the rights of the woman just as much as I do in those of the man, and indeed, a little more. * * * She can do the best work in her home if she has healthy outside interests and occupations in addition."

"I do not ask the ballot for woman as a favor; I say that it should be given to her as a right. To deny the mother the vote seems to me so preposterous that our decendants will fail to understand how we could call ourselves self-governing and democratic."—Sept. 8. 1917.

Ralph Waldo Emerson: "If the wants, the vices, the passions, are allowed a full vote, thru the hands of a half-brutal, intemperate population, I think it but fair that the virtues, the aspirations should be allowd a full voice as an offset, thru the purest of the people."

Henry W. Longfellow: "Woman suffrage is undoubtedly coming, and I for one expect a great deal of good to result from it."

Samuel Gompers: "I am for unqualified woman suffrage as a matter of human justice."

William Dean Howells: "In my opinion suffrage for women is bound to come. There are many arguments against it, but no reasons."

Gifford Pinchot: "To make good citizens of the mothers is the most effective way of making good citizens of the children And in order to make the mothers good citizens, just as in every other kind of work, there is nothing like giving them the responsibility of being good citizens."

Mr. Gallivan: "Democracy cannot live half free and half female. Let the autocracy of sex pass into the discards along with the autocracy of the divine right of kings."

Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, (Author of the "Battle Hymn of the Republic): "The weapon of Christian welfare is the ballot which represents the peaceable assertion of conviction and will. Society everywhere is being converted to its use. Adopt it, O you women, with clean hands and a pure heart! * * * If manhood suffrage is unsatisfactory, it does not at all show that woman suffrage would be. On the contrary we might make it much better by bringing to it the feminine mind, which, by the

way, complements the masculine, and so completes the mind of humanity."

Rev. Dr. Chas. F. Aked: "Nothing since the coming of Christ ever promist so much for the ultimate good of the human race as the intellectual, moral and political emancipation of women."

Prof. Charles Zeublin: "Properly understood, suffrage does not mean the appointing of ward heelers; it means the park system, and public schools, and hospitals, and playgrounds, and public libraries. In matters of this kind we can make no distinction between men and women. Today, to secure the best results in city government, we must have the common service of men and women."

Prof. Henry E. Kelley: "Colorado has never heard of a case of family discord that was even alleged to have originated in woman suffrage."

Justice Louis D. Brandeis: "The change in my opinion with respect to woman suffrage is due to the result of my own experience in various movements with which I have been connected in which we have tried to solve the social, economic, and political problems that have presented themselves from time to time. As years have passt I have been more and more imprest with the difficulty and complexity of those problems, and also with the power of society to solve them; but am convinct that for their solution we must look to the many, not to the few. We need all the people, women as well as men."

Dr. Francis E. Clark (Head of the Christian Endeavor): I do not know of any unanswerable argument against woman suffrage, and I know a great many arguments in its favor. As I have seen its operation in New Zealand and other parts of the world, my belief in it has been strengthened."

William M. Salter: "Suffrage is not a mechanical thing by itself; it is the act of a citizen, and presupposes public aims. I do not plead for a mere mechanical right to put a piece of printed paper in a ballot box. I plead for this right in connection with all that it implies; I plead for a woman's rights to become a full grown human being."

Carrol D. Wright The lack of direct political influence constitutes a powerful reason why women's wages have been kept at a minimum."

Judge Ben Lindsay: "We have in Colorado the most advanct laws of any state in the union for the care and protection of the home and the children, the very foundations of the Republic. We

owe this more to woman suffrage than to any other one cause."

Dr. David Gregg: "Everybody feels the justice of the Golden Rule, 'Do unto others as you would have others do unto you.' Would men have women rob them of the ballot? No. Then let not men rob women of their ballot." That is the Golden Rule put in practical form."

"Mr. Dooley": "If Molly Donahue wint to vote in a livery stable, th' first thing She'd do wud be to get a broom, sweep up the floors, take the harness down from th' walls, an' hang up picture iv Niagary be moonlight; chase out th' watchers an' polise, remove the seegars, make the judges get a shave, an' p'raps invalydate the iliction. It's no job f'r her, an' I told her so."

Lucy Stone: "Some woman risks her life whenever a soldier is born into the world. For years she does picket duty by his cradle. Later on, she is his quartermaster, and gathers his rations. And when that boy grows to a man, shall he say to his mother, 'If you want to vote you must first go and kill somebody?"

David Starr Jordan: "Equal suffrage would tend to broaden the minds of women, and to increase their sense of personal responsibility. It may help to solve the problem of honest and clean government and make our cities centers of sweetness and light, as well as of activity and strength."

Senator Geo. F. Hoar: "We have driven our leading opponents from one position to another until there is not a thoughtful opponent of woman suffrage who is not obliged to deny the doctrine which is affirmed in our Declaration of Independence."

It is a very significant fact that the New York soldiers voted two to one in favor of woman suffrage. They are not the type of men to oppose it; you will find them in abundance around saloons and similar places.

It was a heroic task to start a high civilization in the wild and wooley West, and the work is still going forwards. It was because of these frontier conditions that the pioneers earlier recognized the need of woman's help in social and political endeavor and so gave her the ballot. And now the anti-suffragists have the effrontry to blame all the backward conditions in the West on woman suffrage.

William H. Taft: "I believe that woman suffrage will come eventually. There is one fundamental principle that applies to the whole thing under a representative form of government the interests of any particular set of people are more likely to be

advanct when represented by one of themselves than by one of another class, no matter how altruistic."

The New York Federation of Labor. "The Fifty-Fourth Annual Convention of the New York Federation of Labor, in session here, unanimously recommends to all wage-earning voters of the State to vote and work for the adoption of the Woman Suffrage amendment at the coming election."—Resolution passed Aug. 29, 1917.

Woman suffrage has been endorst by the American Federation of Labor.

Governor Whitman of New York. "Even if it were not the right of woman, even if every phase of our economic and industrial life did not call for the giving to her of the right to vote, I should still say that it is our highest duty to bestow on her the suffrage—that we may add to the conscience of the vote at a time when democracy is fighting for its life."—Aug. 29, 1917.

In New Zealand, in every town and village, and in the remotest country district, government nurses give instructions and aid to mothers, who are visited both before and after the baby comes. Young girls are taught baby hygiene and feeding. Government Maternity Hospitals, government registration of nurses, and complete government registration of births, all aid in the low death rate. Advice from the best medical authorities is printed and distributed free.

President Thomas, of Bryn Mawr College, says: "Experience proves that women as well as men need the ballot to protect them in their special interests and in their power to gain a livelihood. In Philadelphia no woman teacher receives the same salary as men teachers for the same work, and no women, however successful, are appointed to the best-paid and most influential positions in the schools. What is true of Philadelphia is true in the main of the public schools of most of the United States; but it is not true in the States where women have voted long enough to make their influence felt."

William Jennings Bryan. "Judge the two sides of the suffrage cause by the company they keep. A man is known by the company he keeps, and it is just as true of a cause as a man. You can go into any state where woman suffrage is an issue and into any city and you cannot find a single man who profits by vice or makes money out of sin who is of the side of woman suffrage. Why? Why do the wicked unite against woman suffrage? It is because they know instinctively that woman's conscience is against their business. Why is it that the wicked know enough

to combine against woman's conscience while the righteous divide and split hairs and quibble?"

"Reference has been made to one of the arguments used against woman suffrage, that woman must not be allowd to vote because she might hurt herself with the ballot. Well, I'd have more respect for that argument if it had not been used so often on former occasions; but as I look back through history I find no reform that was ever undertaken in behalf of woman that was not met by the same objection, that it would hurt woman to have the reform. Go over in the Orient, where, at the age of twelve or fourteen, girls must cover the face with a veil and after that must never enter the presence of men outside of their own family with their features revealed. When they attempt to overthrow the practice they are told: 'No, woman must not be allowed to injure themselves by taking off the veil." In this country women are not compeld to wear the veil, and who will say that the women of America are inferior to the women of the Orient because they are not compeld to abide by this custom that still prevails there? There isn't a country in the world where the women are better or stronger in character or more virtuous than in the United States.

"Not only has woman profited by this ability to mingle with men, but our society has been infinitely blest by the improvement. When it was first suggested that women should be educated, the same answer was made, that it would injure her, and yet it is true, it has been stated, that the average woman of the rising gneration goes farther in education today than the average man, and we find that instead of injuring our women, it has made them better wives, better mothers, better sisters, better daughters, better members of the church and of society.

"So that argument falls, and those who conscientiously believe that woman will be injured by exercising the ballot need only to go into the states where women have the vote, and their fears will be removd.

"The greatest argument in favor of woman suffrage is the right of a mother to a voice in the environment that shall surround her child. I have three children and I love them, I think, as well as a father can, but I am not in the same class with my wife when it comes to the love of the child, and I do not put any father in the same class with the mother in the love of the child.

"The mother's life trembles in the balance at the child's birth and for years the child is the object of her constant care. She invests in it her nervous force and energy, and endows it with

the wealth of her love; and she dreams of what the child is to be and do, and if a mother's dream only came true, what a different world this would be! The most pathetic struggle that this earth knows is the struggle of the mother to save a child when wicked men lay snares for it, and set traps for it, and as long as you give the ballot to the man who conspires to rob a home of a child it isn't fair, and you know it isn't fair, to tie a mother's hands while she is fighting to protect the home and her children."

PRESIDENT WILSON ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Letter to Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, President of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, January 27, 1917.

"May I not express to you and your organization my congratulations upon the passage of the bill granting to the women the right to vote for presidential elections and for municipal officers? As you know, I have a very real interest in the extension of the suffrage to the women and I feel that every step in this direction should be applauded."

Address to Suffragists at Their National Convention, Sept. safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We shall fight for the things we have always carried nearest our hearts, for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments."

Address to Suffragists at Their National Convention, Sept. 8, 1916. "Woman Suffrage is going to prevail, and that is a very superficial and ignorant view of it which attributes it to mere social unrest. It is not merely because the women are discontented. It is because the women have seen visions of duty, and that is something which we not only cannot resist, but if we be true Americans, we do not wish to resist.

"I have come here to fight with you, to congratulate you that there was a force behind you that will beyond any peradventure be triumphant.

"We are fighting for the essential part of it all, (democracy) namely . . . . to have a right to a voice in the Government under which we live, and when men and women are equally admitted to those rights, we have the best safe guard of justice and of peace that the world affords. There is no other safeguard." —May 16, 1917.

To the French Women: In reply to a memorial presented to him by the French Union for Suffrage. Pres. Wilson said, "I have read your message with the deepest interest and I welcome the opportunity to say that I agree without reservation that the full and sincere democratic reconstruction of the world for which we are striving, and which we are determined to bring about at any cost, will not have been attained completely or adequately until women are admitted to the suffrage, and that only by that action can the nations of the world release for the benefit of future generations, the full ideal force of opinion or the full humane forces of action?

"DO TEACHERS NEED THE BALLOT?"

By Alice Stone Blackwell.

It is the general testimony of educators that the amount of money appropriated for schools is not nearly as large as it ought to be. Both pupils and teachers suffer from overcrowding, and from the necessity of giving each teacher too many pupils for the best educational results.

What is the reason for this lack of money for the schools? One reason is that the mothers and the teachers have no votes. Money can be found for purposes in which voters are interested. Hon. Frederic C. Howe says: "We spend millions for business purposes, for the promotion of industry. And yet, when any organization goes to the city hall for thousands for school purposes, it is met with the response that the city is too poor. We can spend millions for docks, but not thousands for playgrounds."

In New York there are so many more children of school age than there are accommodations for them that many hundred are alaways on half-time. This is an injustice both to the children and to the teacher. The children get only half the time in school to which they are entitled, and the teacher has her strength worn out by having to teach two relays of children daily.

In Philadelphia, in the very year that the superintendent of schools called attention to the fact that there were 20,000 fewer seats in the schools that there were children applying for admission; when thousands could not get in, and when for those who did get in, the accommodations were so poor that children were sitting on broken benches, on boards stretched across the

aisles, on window sills and even on the floor—all this was for lack of money—the city fathers voted $50,000 of public money to entertain the Elks, and $10,000 more to entertain the Order of Patriotic Sons of America. This $60,000 came largely from women's taxes, but the women had no vote as to how it should be spent.

Almost everywhere the schools are pinched for money; but in the equal suffrage states this is not the case. The Colorado State Superintendent of Public Instruction said to me: "Some people in Colorado grumble about the size of the school tax, but our schools have money enough." Gen. Irving Hale of Denver, says: "The Extension of suffrage to women has made it easier to secure liberal appropriations for education." Colorado appropriates more money per capita for education than any of the Eastern states, which are so much older and richer.

Of the inadequate amount of money provided for school purposes, the women teachers do not get their fair share. In Massachusetts the average pay of a woman teacher in the public schools is about one-third that of a man. In New York, the richest city in America, the women teachers for years used their "indirect influence" to the utmost before they finally succeded in securing equal pay for equal work. In Wyoming, in Colorado and in all the states where women vote, men and women teachers get equal pay for equal work.

Another bane of the schools and especially of the women teachers, is the influence of partisan politics. Mrs. Helen L. Grenfell, who servd three terms as State Superintendent of Public Instruction for Colorado, and is highly esteemd by educators there, says:

"After twenty years' experience I can say that our school boards are absolutely non-political and party affiliation is never considered in the appointment of teachers. I have never heard of a member of a school board being elected because he belongd to this or that party. Generally both parties are represented on the same board. Sometimes a board principally Democratic is found in a Republican community and vice versa. Our teachers are free to vote according to their own consciences. I have seen or heard of more party politics in school matters in one block in Albany, Buffalo or Philadelphia than on the 103,925 square miles of Colorado soil."

WHAT WOMEN WANT

The legislative program of the Federation of Women's Clubs in the recently enfranchised states shows the results women are trying to gain by their votes.

In Montana women were enfranchised in 1914. 1915 their legislative program included an Equal Guardianship Law, Widowd Mothers' Pensions and Teachers' Pensions, all of which were secured.

In Nevada the year following the getting of the vote, the legislative program of the former State Suffrage Association included more stringent divorce and gambling laws, the Eight Hour Working Day for Women, raising the Age of Consent from sixteen to eighteen, and a measure to open the schools as civic centers.

In California the last legislative program of the organizd women was: Home teaching of cooking and sanitation, strengthening the Child Labor Laws, giving women complete control over their own wages, and a model Birth Registration Act.

In Illinois, despite the fact that women have only a partial suffrage, they are beginning to have considerable effect on legislation. Since they were given the vote they have succeeded in getting the Red Light Injunction and Abatement Act, abolished fines for street walking, made birth registration compulsory, secured equal pay for equal work (thus decreasing the possibility of men losing jobs and being supplanted by women), obtained minimum wage for men and women, one day's rest in seven and closd saloons on Sunday. Other undisputed results are cleaner polls and more orderly elections.

The Year-Book of the Anti-Saloon League for 1915 says of Illinois: "The Woman suffrage bill has provd to be the most valuable piece of temperance legislation that the state has enacted In one election 1,150 saloons were closed; 900 of these were closd on account of majorities found in women's ballot boxes. The woman suffrage law has been of more value inasmuch as it has aided materially in enforcing the law.

The foregoing facts speak for themselves. Yet they are not all. Living witnesses—ministers by the hundreds—are testifying to the improved moral conditions when both men and women vote. In view of these indisputable facts and testimony, will you not help those who are struggling to keep your state in the forefront of all just, righteous and moral movements?

THE DIRECT WAY

By Frances Squire Potter.

. . . . . .Besides, is it not even more "ladylike," more "feminine," more "graceful," less "ostentatious," less "talkative," does it not "take less time from the home and the children," to go into the nearest polling place and register a vote, than to dress becomingly, journey down town, visit office after office, and take up the time of busy men who are so full of their own opinions that they really have little wish to represent different opinions? If, indeed, we have time for this social politics would it not be equally "womanly" to call upon women in their homes, instead of upon men in their offices—I mean upon those women of less opportunities than ourselves, who so often are spoken of as a menace to equal suffrage? These women have not so many opinions to combat or win over, and whatever personal interests acting against good government they might have, these doubtless would be no stronger, at least, than those of the men. Would it not be well for us to interest and educate the women with some of this time bestowed upon the men under the present system? And would not the public-spirited women of today do this instantly if equal suffrage were granted?

EXTRACTS FROM CIRCULARS.

National Woman Suffrage Pub. Co., Furnisht by Miss Marjorie Shuler, Secretary for Oklahoma.

BETTER BABIES

300,000 babies die every year in the United States before they are one year old.

Comparison of the infant death rate of Civilized Nations. Number of deaths under one year per 1,000 births:

New Zealand (1913)	59
Norway (1912)	68
Australia (1913)	72
Sweden (1911)	72
France (1912)	78
United tates (1915)	89
Germany (1912)	147
Russia (1909)	248

The lowest death rate of babies in the world is in New Zealand. Why? Because the government realizes the value of babies and does everything in its power to educate the mothers and pro-

tct the baby. Women have had the vote in New Zealand for twenty years. The first three countries with the lowest death rate are all Woman Suffrage countries.

In Italy, Spain, Germany and Russia, where the death rate is highest women have even less say in regard to public affairs and hygiene than they have in the United States.

Comparison of the infant death rate of some American cities 1915 with that of Dunedin, New Zealand. Number of deaths under 1 year per 1,000 births.

Dunedin, New Zealand. (The Lowest in the World	38
New York City	98
Albany, N. Y.	126
Jersey City, N. J.	132
Reading, Pa.	151
Nashville, Tenn.	182

In the United States, California has become the Banner Baby State. It has the highest birth rate in the Union and a very low death rate.

In the United States every care is given to animal and plant life, but the government concerns itself little with babies.

"What has the United States Government to do with women and children?" as one Congressman tersely put it, expressed the attitude of the governmnt as it was for many years. Since women began to be represented in Washington, there has been a change. After many years of urging, Congress, in 1912, established a Children's Bureau and $25,000 a year was appropriated. In 1915 this was increased to $165,000, but $600,000 was given to protect our hogs!

When, of all the civilized world, the country that has had woman suffrage the longest has the lowest death rate, and the two countries with the next lowest rate all have woman suffrage, can there be a doubt that woman suffrage has brought about better and healthier living conditions for all the people?

Isn't it evident that when mothers are represented in government and their opinions and interests are consulted, babies have a better chance? Isn't it proved that women with the ballot do not neglect their home and babies? Giving the ballot to women not only helps them to do their own work more effectively, but actually increases the wealth of the nation.

Why the Working Woman Needs the Vote.

Every year more and more women are going into industry. Why is this?

1. The cost of living is rising, and in many families the woman's wages are needed to eke out the family income.

2. The standard of living is rising, and workingmen's families demand better conditions, and must have a larger income to meet them.

3. Women living in cities can no longer help sustain the family by farm work, dairy work, or by spinning and weaving; therefore their only ways of helping to provide for the family are: Either to take work home, which in most cases produces the evil results of sweat-shop work, with poor conditions of work and poorer pay; or to go out to work in a factory or shop. Now is the woman's work a help to the family in the long run? Not so long as women are cheap labor.

Every union man knows how dangerous and harmful is the competition of child labor; it is dangerous because it is cheap, and cuts down the man's wages.

Women's labor, as long as it is cheap, is just as dangerous, and for just the same reason. When women organize and vote they will get equal pay for equal work, and they will no longer compete unfairly with men. Then men's wages will improve, and, though fewer women will be employd at the higher wages, this will not be a hardship, because the increase in man's wages will give the family the larger income needed without its being necessary for so many women to work outside the home.

SOME COMMON QUESTIONS ANSWERED

By Sarah Platt Decker.

So much has been said and written on the matter of the working of equal suffrage in Colorado that it is difficult to present it in any new phase. I shall attempt to give only an individual opinion upon the following much-disputed questions:

1. Do the earnest, high-minded women of Colorado vote? Yes, most emphatically. I do not hesitate to say that the best women of Colorado have far more conscience in filling their responsibilities as voters than the men of the same class. It is also true that women of standing in the community have great influence with men who are not particularly interested in public affairs. We are constantly asked by visitors to Colorado. "How do you have time to vote?" as if voting was like eating or baking. It takes just about one hour in a year to cast all the ballots necessary and allowable.

2. Does not the vote of the disreputable, low class of wom-

en counterbalance the better element? No; the women of the half-world generally do not vote. They are constantly changing their residences and their names. They do not wish to give any data concering themselves, their age, names or number and street; they prefer to remain unidentified. Occasionally some disreputable master compels these slaves to vote for his own purposes, but that is a rare occurrence.

3. Is it not the case that women generally vote as the men of their household dictate? No. Such has not been my observation or experience. Among the laboring classes, if the wife cannot vote as her husband desires, and he is not willing she would make her own choice, she refuses to vote at all. I have been surprised at the honest maintenance of opinion in this regard among the wives of laboring men. One of the most cultivated, belovd and influential women of the State was sitting as a delegate in one party convention, not long since, while her husband was at the same time addressing another assembly representing opposite party views. But the situation excited no comment. Suffrage makes women individuals.

4. Has the woman vote wholly purified politics, and has it banished saloons? No, to obth questions. It would be beyond reason to expect such a result. Women have been in churches and in society since the beginning of time, but there are still vicious minds and sinful deeds in both religious and social circles. The most we assert is that if we pour a clear stream into a muddy one, we shall have a "moving of the waters" for betterment. The presence of women at the polls as officers and voters has brought quiet and order, while party conventions are much freer from personal wrangles, profane language and vulgar allusions because women are sitting as delegates.

5. Has woman suffrage been a success? Yes. All thinking women admit that we have made some mistakes since we have had the right of suffrage. But that has been the experience of all newly-enfranchised people. In the beginning of equal suffrage in Colorado the women voters had no guide except the traditions and advice of the men of their families and acquaintance. That teaching was the old one of party politics. We followed a blind lead and to me it was a terrible awakening to discover that my party was just as bad as the other, and the other party fully as high-minded in its purposes as mine. But in spite of mistakes, disappointments or discouragements, there is an indescribable uplift in the thought that one is no longer classt with "criminals, paupers and idiots." There is a splendid womanly in-

dependence in being a voting citizen, and an absorbing interest in fulfilling the duty of citizenship, and there is a much more chivalrous devotion and respect on the part of men, who look upon their sisters not as playthings, not as property, but as equals and fellow citizens.

TESTIMONIES FROM SUFFRAGE STATES

CALIFORNIA SPEAKS: California's Proclamation to the nation, Current Resolution, May 12, 1915:

WHEREAS, The issue of Woman Suffrage is pending in many states of the Union, and

WHEREAS, The operation and effect of the enfranchisement of women in California is being constantly misrepresented in such states and used there as arguments in opposition to the granting of suffrage to women; therefore be it

RESOLVD, By the Senate of the forty first session of the Legislature of the State of California, the Assembly concurring, that the experience of this State amply justifies the adoption of Woman Suffrage by the people in October, 1911, and be it further

RESOLVD, That so successful has been the operation and effect of granting political right to women equal to those held by men that it is generally conceded that were the question to be again voted on by the people of this State, it would be endorst by an overwhelming majority; and be it

RESOLVD, That the adoption of Woman Suffrage is one of the important factors contributing to the markt political, social and industrial advancement made by our people in recent years, and that any disparagement of the cause of woman suffrage attempted elsewhere on the ground that Woman suffrage is not satisfactory to this State, has no basis in fact, and is signally disprovd by the acknowledgd intelligence and discrimination shown by women voters in the settling of our great political and industrial problems at the polls.

COLORADO SPEAKS. Colorado's Proclamation to the Nation, after 22 years experience with suffrage.

WHEREAS, The question of Woman Suffrage has become an important issue in many States of the Union, and

WHEREAS, Woman Suffrage was made the subject of misrepresentations in other states where the question is an issue,

THEREFORE, We deem it to be our duty to say that ex-

perience has demonstrated that Woman Suffrage is not only a just recognition of the rights of all before the law, but has proven in all respects materially helpful to good governmet among the people, and to a noticeable degree has inculcated a higher respect for the majesty and supremacy of the law.

Colorado—George A. Carlson, Governor. One of Colorado's biggest assets is her voting public which consists of intelligent women as well as men. The public, like the individual, is not infallible, but the voters can point to advanced legislation along every humane line. In all reforms the women have taken an active part and important movements often have had their inception in small gatherings of public spirited women, who were willing and able to give time to forwarding questions which at first sight men may have deemd unimportant.

Utah—William Hay, Governor. The women of Utah generally avail themselves of the franchise and their participation in government affairs has been of an uplifting nature. They visit the polling places and hold office with assurance of most respectful and courteous consideration * * * The women and women's organizations have been active in promoting legislative measures tending to moral uplift, and they have been particularly active in securing our splendid Juvenile Court code, the nine-hour law for women and many other measures of an advanced nature.

No record is kept as to the percentage but I judge that quite as many women avail themselves of the franchise as do men. Women have servd in both branches of the Legislature with ability and have been elected to county and municipal offices and discharged their duties with a high degree of efficiency.

Idaho—W. Alexander, Governor. The women of Idaho are not politicians or place-hunters, but they ar independent, intelligent and honest and are the most potent force for good government and civic righteousness. Their interests lie at the foundation of civilization and of American institutions—the home—the family—the school—the church and the civic environment—these are the things which their ballot cherishes and protects inviolate.

To the refining influence of the women I wholly attribute the cleansing of our polling places and the purity of our ballot. Woman suffrage, instead of contaminating women, has elevated and ennobld manhood. There is absolutely no sentiment in Idaho for the repeal of woman suffrage—such a measure would fail to carry a single county in the State.

Washington—Ernest Lister, Governor. I know of no one who favord giving the women of the State the right to vote who today opposes it, and large numbers of those who were opposd to the constitutional amendment when it was before the people are today in favor of it. The results have certainly indicated that the women have assisted, rather than otherwise, in bringing about a better condition in public affairs.

I am sure that any suggestion to change back to the old system would receive but little encouragement from the voters of Washington.

California—Hiram W. Johnson, Governor. Since its adoption, equal suffrage in California has been put to the most thorough and severe test. Every conceivable sort of election has been held in the past three years and women have been calld upon to exercise their new privilege and perform their added duty not alone in the usual fashion but in various primaries, including one for presidential preference; also in local option elections. They have been compeld to pass upon laws and governmental policies and referendum. The women have met the test and equal suffrage in California has fully justified itself. In 1910 by a very narrow margin the amendment carried. Were it again to be submitted the vote in its favor would be overwhelming.

Oregon—James Withycombe, Governor. It gives me real pleasure to say that equal suffrage is proving a boon to this State. I think that by their interest and their continued political activity the women of Oregon are demonstrating the fallacy of the statement, often advanct, that once they receivd the ballot women would be loath to exercise their rights and live up to their political responsibilities. To my mind woman suffrage will prove a real benefit to this state and will ultimately be universal throughout the United States.

Arizona—Geo. W. P. Hunt, Governor. Since the women of Arizona were enfranchisd their influence and activity have been potent factors in governmental affairs and in maintaining a high standard of citizenship * * * The women electors have evinced an intelligent and praiseworthy interest in public affairs and none of the evils so loudly predicted by the opponents of equal suffrage during the campaign of 1912 have become apparent since women acquird the right to vote.

Arizona's experience with equal suffrage in practice is most assuredly a vindication of woman's struggle for enfranchisement and bears me out fully in the plea I am making for the women of New York.

Kansas—Arthur Capper, Governor. The extension of equal suffrage to the women of Kansas is one of the biggest things the men of Kansas have ever done—and Kansas men are accustomed to doing big things. Kansas gave her women school suffrage and liked it. Afterwards she gave them municipal suffrage and liked it better. Afterwards she gave them full suffrage and liked it best. I t has had immediate effect for good; it has impeld all political parties to include in their program and platform humanitarian projects and moral issues which previously they had ignored. It has made a more careful selection of nominees. It is already having wholesome effect in cleansing the state of spoilsman politics and is making for higher ideals in both public and private life.

Enemies of woman suffrage are making desperate efforts to give circulation to the misstatement that the good women do not embrace the opportunity to use the ballot even when it is given to them. Nothing is farther from the truth as far as Kansas is concernd. At the general election held in this state last November, which was the first time the women of Kansas had the opportunity to exercise their full right of citizenship—a right which long ago should have been theirs—nearly as large a proportion of the women went to the polls and voted as did the men. The good women of Kansas, than whom there is a no more intelligent body anywhere in the whole world, voted and voted right, nor did their vote always tally with that of the men of the house. They workt for the right to vote and they knew how to use that right. They had demanded all during the campaign that the candidates should stand and work for certain things—clean things, uplifting things—and they voted for the men who stood for those things. And when they had registered their approval or disapproval of the candidates on the ballot, they went back to their business—their children and their homes—just as men went back to their stores, their offices and their shops.

What the women do in Kansas, the women will do in New York. We can trust the women. They know how to protect their homes. I am for national suffrage.

Illinois—E. F. Dunne, Governor. I favor woman suffrage and two years ago signd a law passed by our Legislature giving very liberal rights to the women in the State of Illinois. After two years experience with the law, I am still in favor of woman suffrage and believe it for the best interest of the community.

There is no strong sentiment in this State for the repeal of the Woman Suffrage Law. On the contrary there is an agitation

in favor of extending the rights of women to vote for all municipal offices, all offices not enumerated in the Constitution of the State and upon all questions of public policy.

Montana—S. V. Stewart, Governor. We have had short time to observe the working of the new order, but Montana women are giving numerous evidences of intelligent interest and a determination to measure up to their new responsibilities. I believe beneficial results will follow.

Nevada—Emmet D. Boyle, Governor. Since November numerous municipalities have held elections throughout the State but no state-wide elections have been held. For the municipal election a very large percentage of the women entitled to vote registered and the great majority of those registered voted. The women of the State have taken an active and intelligent interest in all public questions and have shown no tendency toward revolutionary methods in government. I have been an observer of equal suffrage in adjoining western States where after a trial of the system covering years no one seriously considers a return to the old order of things.

Men are more numerous than women here, and there is no place in the world where women are held in higher respect than in the West. We have given western women suffrage as a matter of simple justice and the women themselves have embraced the right to a voice in public affairs in such a manner as to effectively disprove the silly argument that they could not use this voice without a sacrifice of their womanly qualities.

CONDENST PARAGRAFS

The subordination of women is a fact; no one can dispute it. Can any man tell why?

Mutual respect between man and woman is only possible when they meet on equal terms.

The woman who has no interest larger than the affairs of her children is not capable of training them.

There are 3 1-2 times as many male immigrants as female. Woman suffrage, then, would increase the proportion of the native vote.

When women suffrage was adopted in Great Britain the news was not allowd to be publisht in Germany. It is not necessary to ask why.

For years women have been asking for a State Library

Commission but in vain. Women estimate the value of books much more highly than men do.

Those who say that women can "influence" legislature to give them what they want certainly never servd on the legislative committee of women's clubs.

It is claimd that suffrage is not a right but a privilege. A mere quibble. It is the same for men that it is for women whether you call it a right or a privilege.

The rich may say "Women should stay at home and cook the dinner"; but the poor know that if women did stay at home there would often be no dinner to cook.

All admit that woman's influence is good in all matters concerning public morals. Even the antis argue this. If it is good, then, why not more of it? Why restrict it?

After what women are doing in this war it seems amazing that any man would oppose giving them a voice in the government of the nation they have done so much to save.

How many men would swap jobs with their wives? How many women would be glad to swap with their husbands? That tells the story. Women are being cheated and wronged.

There are women "slackers" who are afraid of the ballot because they like better to be petted, to live in idleness and vanity rather than take a real part in the life of the world.

Women in common with other citizens have social duties which can be performed only with the ballot. The state needs woman's vote fully as much if not more than the women themselves.

Is it creditable to men when they are "influenced" by women in their voting? A man ought to vote his convictions, and he should not be "influenced" by money, self-interest, woman or anything else.

Jan. 10, 1968, the first woman suffrage bill was introduced in Congress. On Jan. 10, 1918, just fifty years later, it passt the house by a vote of 274 to 136. All the representatives from Oklahoma voted for it.

Since the state has taken over the great functions of social service which used to belong to women—the teaching of children, the care of the sick, etc.—women must vote or be dispossest of all direct part in these human activities.

The wife has an undoubted right to half of the family income. Who can dispute it? Yet the only way a wife can get a stingy husband to give her any part of his earnings is to get a divorce. Then the law will make him pay alimony.

England has granted full suffrage to 6,000,000 women after 50 years of agitation. Most of her colonies had already granted it. Women have long voted for every office in England except members of parliament, and now they vote for them.

It is argued that all women do not wish to vote. Well, woman suffrage will not make them vote if they do not wish to. Because a few women do not wish to vote is that any reason why they should seek to deprive others of the privilege?

The only just and reasonable policy is to give women the ballot. Those who wish to use it will do so, and thus justify the arguments of the affirmative; those who do not wish to use it will not vote and so justify the arguments of the negative.

One anti argues that woman suffrage is bad because it intensifies individualism and so increases divorce. Another argues that suffrage is socialistic. Now since socialism is the very opposite of individualism how can woman suffrage favor both at once?

In the past, men, legislating as a class for women as a class, have done exactly what every ruling class has alaways done—they have discriminated against the class which had no legal voice. No class was ever altruistic enuf to legislate for another class.

It is objected that if women vote they will also wish to hold office. Well, they can't hold office unless they are elected; and they can't be elected unless the majority votes for them. And if the majority wish to have a woman in public office why shouldn't the majority rule?

The unit should be the family, it is said. Then why not be consistent and disfranchise all old bachelors—every one without a family? But even if the family is the unit why should a drunken husband cast its vote insted of the long suffering wife who keeps the family together?

The antis harp a great deal about suffrage being a "privilege" not a "right." The Constitution calls it a "right." Amend ment XV, Sec. 1;—"The right of the citizens of the United States to vote shall be denied or abridged etc." That settles it so far as this discussion is concernd.

The common reasoning is thus: Boys and girls are acknowledged to be distinct beings. Now boys study Greek, and Algebra, Law and Medicine; therefore girls should not. It is as if one should say: Boys and girls are distinct beings. Now boys eat beef and potatoes; therefore girls should not.

Every woman ought to be a good citizen. To be that she

must be informd on all public matters. Without such information she cannot do her full duty either to her children or to the community. If she has the right to opinions on public matters, she has the right to the ballot to make them effective.

Shortly before her death. Julia Ward Howe sent a questionaire to ministers in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah and Idaho. The answers were favorable to woman suffrage; Episcopilians 2 to 1; Baptists 7 to 1; Congregationalists 8 to 1; Methodists 10 to 1; and Presbyterians 11 to 1. Such testimony as that is conclusive.

Some women wish they were men. This is deplorable; and every thoughtful man must ask if his injustice and unfairness to woman has causd it. Even if it were not best, either for women or for the race, why should men not allow women to vote if they wish? Men must concede all that tends to equalize woman's lot.

Antis say, "But bad women would vote." The census of 1900 showd that there were more than 32 times as many men in the penitentiaries as women. Why not apply that objection to men then, since there are so many more bad men than bad women? With woman suffrage the proportion of bad voters would be reduced.

Antis claim that women are too emotional to vote. Do they also claim that the most unemotional men—the most cold, hardhearted, unsympathetic men—are the best citizens? Is it not the more emotional men who lead in all reforms? Are they not universally the most public spirited? We need more emotion in our political life.

It is said that men and women are different, therefore women should not vote. A man cannot sing soprano and a woman cannot sing bass; therefore they should not sing together. That men and women are different is a far better reason why women should vote than why they should not. Their cooperation gives us the complete voice of humanity.

While many women would doubtless line up with regular parties there is no question but that they would add greatly to the independent, uncertain vote; and the increase of this vote is one of the greatest needs of American politics. It is only by such a vote that new measures can be considerd on their merits, or parties held to strict accountability.

Equal suffrage is a plain corollary to coeducation. We train our boys and girls together from the kindergarten to the university; we train them to work together thru life; then why should we exclude from the highest service, that of citizenship,

the women, who are most interested in the moral and social elevation of society? To do so is irrational.

It is claimed that women cannot hold public office and care for children. This is true; but all women are not permitted to rear children. And after the children are reared there remain many years of the very best and maturest years of woman's life which are now practically wasted. Society needs just that service which mature women can render even if some women do desire to shirk it.

The thing which threatens womanhood is not the ballot, but the factory, the office, the store where men have already permitted her to be driven. If men were supporting women they might have some show of right to deny her the ballot. But when women have to support themselves even in competition with men, and in thousands of cases, help to support the men, the denial of the ballot is a stupendous wrong.

It is perfectly well known that the liquor trafic and all its supporters and apologists are opposd to woman suffrage. In the recent campaign for woman suffrage in Ohio the chief opposition came from the liquor interests who knew that the great majority of women would vote against them if permitted. It is absolutely undeniable that prohibition could not have been enforced in Kansas without municipal suffrage for women.

Even if women did not take a constant and active part in politics it is very desirable and even necessary for them to vote when exceptionally great issues are up for consideration in which they are deeply interested. That would make political results more uncertain so that manipulators could not calculate. The men would never know when the women would rise up; so political managers would be on their good behaviour all the time.

It is argued that the ballot would not be good for women. Who is to judge? Where did men get the right to set themselves up as exclusive judges of what is best for women? What evidence appears that they are competent. Is it any wonder that women lose patience with such unreasonable, selfish assumption and bigotry? Some put up the casuistry that the ballot is a privilege, not a right. Suppose it is. Where do men get the right to withhold it?

If women lose beauty, tenderness, and grace it will not be due to the ballot but to the fact that she is compeld to labor under unwholesome conditions. While men have been denying women a voice in the decisions of society womn have been driven out of their homes to earn their bread. Insted of prating

about the suffrage taking women away from home men ought to welcome their assistance in dealing with problems they have faild to solve.

There have been men who under present conditions have compeld women to slave over a washtub, to support children, and to furnish liquor and tobacco for the beastly loafers who claim the legal right to lord it over them. Such wrongs as these are infinite wrongs. Greater are not conceivable. If men cannot redress them, why refuse women the right of self defense? The men who are not guilty of such conduct cannot defend or support those who are.

The Oklahoma State Press Association adopted the following resolution, May 25, 1918; "Believing that the time has fully come when we should extend to our women of this great state an expression of our fullest confidence in their ability to share with us the privileges and duties of citizenship. Be it Resolvd, that we express our belief in woman suffrage and pledge our support to the referendum to be submitted to the voters of Oklahoma at the general election Nov. 5, 1918."

Antis say that if the wife gets equal vote with the husband he should no longer be required to support her. The husband does not always support the wife, and when he does it is not in the usual meaning of the word. It is merely a division of labor, and the wife is the exception who does not do her full share and usually far more. Let us have done with the hypocritical claim that the husband supports the wife. He helps to support his family, and he could hardly do more than his share if he would.

It is claimd that woman suffrage will increase divorce. Wyoming adopted it in 1869. During the 20 years from 1870 to 1890 divorce increast in the entire U. S. about three times as fast as the population. In the western states exclusive of Wyoming the increase was four times as fast. But in Wyoming the increase of divorces was only half as fast as the increase of population. There is more divorce in the West than in the East but it is certain that woman suffrage is not the cause of the difference.

It is said that women can influence legislation now. Yes, but they cannot influence it enuf. At the request of Oklahoma women a bill was introduced in the Oklahoma legislature requiring men to have a physician's certificate as to their physical fitness before marriage. Awful tragedies are constantly occurring for lack of such legislation; there is no protection for the wife. The bill was rejected and not without some sneers and derision. Good clean men in the legislature need the help of women.

Women are far better judges than men of what wars against the home and are much more sensitive to it. In the towns how many men spend their evenings at home? How many know as much about their homes as they should? There are men who cannot tell how many children they have without stopping to count up. Many are not only ignorant of home problems and needs but are indifferent to them. In many homes the man himself is the chief problem, yet he usurps the right to vote for his whole household.

An efficiency expert, traveling in Switzerland saw a woman who was rocking a cradle with one foot, turning a churn with the other, knitting with both hands, singing to the baby, and reading a book. A companion said she was 100 per cent efficient. "No", said the expert, "she is only 67 per cent efficient; she might be pressing a cheese." But even if she were sitting on a cheese and were denied all voice in public affairs her chief value to the world would still be unrecognized. Woman is not 100 per cent efficient until all her powers are utilized.

It is easy to criticise the excesses of the English suffragettes besieging the House of Commons, and American suffragettes picketing the White House, but any man ought to see that women would not do such things unless there was great urgency. If women wish to vote that bad why not let them? What right has man to arrogate to himself the decision of what is best for women? Could anything be more galling to womankind? Why not let them decide for themselves? They certainly are as competent both mentally and morally as men are. Women only ask for liberty to vote when they deem it necessary; why not let them?

The woman suffrage discussion illustrates how easy it is to prove almost anything by statistics. In Colorado, for example, mining is the leading interest and labor troubles in the mines, with which women have nothing to do. have overshadowed everything else. Some things are imperfect in Colorado but they might have been worse without suffrage. There is no doubt about one thing: It was the votes of women which savd the Juvenile Court of Judge Benjamin Lindsey of Denver. In all the confusion this fact is outstanding, that in a great test affecting the welfare of children and morals the women voted better than the men. We must judge suffrage in Colorado by the legislation which has succeeded not by that which has faild, for it would have faild without suffrage. No one has ever shown a case where the women voted worse than the men.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE MUST FAIL

(The Independent, October 11, 1915)

By Mrs. A. J. George

Woman suffrage must ultimately fail. It is based upon a fallacy, and no fallacy has ever made a permanent conquest over mankind.

The fallacy of woman suffrage lies in the belief that there is in our social order a definite sex division of interests, and that the security of woman's interests depends upon her possession of the elective franchise.

"The history of mankind," declared the founders of the movement, "is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of man toward woman, having as the indirect object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her. Man has endeavored in every way he could," continues this arraignment of the fathers, husbands and sons of these self-styled mothers of the revolution, "to destroy her confidence in her own powers, to lessen her self-respect and to make her willing to lead a dependent and abject life."

In a healthy state of society there is no rivalry between men and women; in the economy of life they have different duties, but their interests in a well-ordered government are represented, automatically and inevitably, by the men of their social group. It would be a fatal day for the race when women could obtain their rights only by a victory wrested at the polls from reluctant men. These truths are elementary and self-evident, yet all are negatived by the votes-for-women movement.

That the vote is not an inalienable right is affirmed by Supreme Court decisions, the practise of nations and dictates of common sense. No state can ever enfranchise all its citizens, and since the stability of government rests ultimately upon a relentless enforcement of law, the maintenance of a sound fiscal policy and such adjustment of the delicate interweaving of international relations as makes for peace and prosperity, it is right that the state should place the responsibility of government upon those best equipped to perform its manifold duties.

Woman's citizenship is as real as man's and no reflection upon her abilities is involved in the assertion that woman is not fitted for government either by nature or by the contact of daily experience. The casting of a ballot is the last step in a long process of political organization, it is the signing of a contract to undertake vast responsibilities, for the following of the ballot

to its conclusion alone makes the body politic sound. Otherwise political power without its political responsibility threatens disaster to all.

We have made a few crude experiments in double suffrage, but nowhere has equal suffrage been tried. If the average woman is to be a voter, she must accept jury service and aid in the protection of life and property. When the mob threatens, she must not shield herself behind her equal in government. She must relinquish her rights and exemptions under the law and in civil life she is to take her place as a responsible elector and compete with man as the governor of the race. Such equality would be a brutal and retrogressive view of woman's "rights." It is impossible—and here we have the unanswerable answer to woman suffrage theories.

No question of superiority or equality is involved in the opposition to votes for women. The test of woman's worth is her ability to solve the problems she must face as a woman if the race is not to deterioate and civilization perish. The woman suffrage movement is an imitation-of-man movement, and as such merits the condemnation of every normal man and woman.

The attempt to interpret woman's service to the state in terms of political activity is a false appraisal of the contribution she has always made to the general welfare. Doubtless we can live thru a good deal of confusion, but it is not on any lines of functional unfitness that life is to be fulfilled. Woman must choose with discrimination those channels of activity wherein "what she most highly values may be won." Are these values in the department of government, or in the equally essential departments of education, society and religion? It is thru physical, intellectual, and moral education that our citizenship is gradually improved, and here woman's opportunities are supreme. If women are not efficient in their own dominion, then, in the name of common sense, let them be trained for efficiency in that dominion and not diffuse their energies by dragging them thru the devious paths of political activities.

Equal suffrage is clearly impossible; double suffrage, tried under most favorable conditions, in sparsely settled western states, has made no original contribution to the problem of sound government. On the other side of the ledger we find that the enfranchisement of women has increased taxes, magnified the menace of an indifferent electorate and swelled the body of unenforceable laws.

The confusion of social and personal rights with political,

the substitution of emotionalism for investigation and knowledge; the mania for uplift by legislation, have widely advertised the suffrage propaganda, while the reforms for which the founders of the suffrage movement declared women needed the vote have all been accomplished by the votes of men. The vote has been withheld thru the indifference and opposition of women, for this is the only woman's movement which has been met by the organized opposition of women.

Woman suffrage is the political phase of feminism; the whole sweep of the relation of the sexes must be revisd if the woman's vote is to mean anything more than two people doing what one does now. Merely to duplicate the present vote is unsound economy. To reinforce those who clamor for individual rights is to strike at the family as a self-governing unit upon which the state is built.

This is not a question of what some women want or do not want—it is solely a question of how woman shall best contribute her part to general welfare. Anti-suffragists contend that woman serves best by remaining non-partisan and working for the common good outside the realms of political strife. To prove this they point to what women have done without the ballot and what they have failed to do with it.

Anti-suffragists are optimists. They are concerned at the attempt of an organized, aggressive, well-financed minority to force its will upon the majority of women thru a false interpretation of representative democracy, but they know that a movement so false in its conception, so false in its economy, so false in its reflections upon men and its estimate of women, so entirely unnecessary and unnatural, cannot achieve a permanent success.

THE DIVORCE EVIL AND WOMAN SUFFRAGE

By Maybelle Stuard.

Executive Secretary of Oklahoma Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

The statistics of divorce prove beyond a doubt that this great social menace is more prevalent and increasing faster in the Woman Suffrage West than in the Male Suffrage East. Treating the matter from the standpoint of locality with only incidental reference to suffrage, let us compare the New England

states with the nine states which adopted Woman Suffrage in the period of 1869-1912.

In the 20 years 1887-1906 there were 13.6 divorces to every 100 marriages in the nine states referred to.

In the same period in New England there were only 7.4 divorces to every 100 marriages.

The increase in the number of divorces in the twenty years 1887-1906 over the previous twenty-year period was:

United States	187.7 per cent
Nine Suffrage States	241.8 per cent
New England States	68.8 per cent

These figures show that the divorce evil flourishes out of all proportion in the territories which adopted Woman Suffrage.

There are just two possible answers to the foregoing questions. One is that Woman Suffrage, by introducing a new element of discord into the family tends to increase marital infelicity and consequent divorce. In other words, that Woman Suffrage is the last straw in many a family where other elements of discord would not be sufficient in themselves to sever the bond between husband and wife.

The other answer is that the states which have adopted woman suffrage are inhabited by a comparatively unstable people, who hold the marriage bond much more lightly than do the more conservative and perhaps more religious people of New England. Which horn of the dilemma do the suffragists wish to take?

Woman Suffrage and Mormonism.

Miss Elizabeth B. Vermilye, president of the International Council for Patriotic Service, speaking recently (1916) before the School for Women's Home Missionary Societies in East Northfield, Massachusetts, said:

"Mormonism owns Utah, has a majority of the population in Idaho, the balance of power in Nevada, Montana, Wyoming, Arizona, New Mexico and Oregon, and immense influence in Colorado, California and Washington."

Miss Vermilye wasn't discussing suffrage, remember. She was simply discussing Mormonism. Isn't it rather significant that every Woman Suffrage state except Kansas is in the list of states which she says are owned or controlled by Mormonism? Suffragists tell us that Woman Suffrage has proved itself good by spreading to neighboring states. Well, here is something else

that is spreading to neighboring states—Mormonism, the foe of Christianity and Democracy.

The Mormon church claims, and the claim is historically accurate, to have originated the votes for women idea in this country. It is not without significance therefore, that Mormonism and Woman Suffrage have spread simultaneously over the radical territory of the West.

Does Mormonism own and control Woman Suffrage states because of Woman Suffrage, or in spite of Woman Suffrage?

What have the women voters of Utah, Idaho, Wyoming, Arizona, Oregon, Colorado, California and Washington done to check the growth of Mormonism in their midst? And if they haven't done anything, why haven't they?

Woman Suffrage and Feminism.

According to Mrs. Beatrice Forbes-Robertson Hale, noted Suffrage speaker, and writer, Woman Suffrage is an "essential branch of the tree of feminism." "Feminism," she says in her book on the subject, "is gradually supplying to women the things they Most Need," and among these things she mentions "easy divorce" and "economic independence."

Feminism is variously defined, but in whatever guise of words we find it we see the same ear-marks of revolt against Nature and Christian Morals. The feminist is An Avowed Enemy of the Home.

Writing in McClure's Magazine for March 1913, Inez Milholland Boissevain, a prominent Suffragist, foresees with delight, "the beginning of a breakdown of the artificial barriers in the way of more natural observance of the mating instince." In other words, "Free Love."

In the Forum for April, 1915, Lottie M. Montgomery says, among other things too indecent to quote:

"In the futu__re woman shall make the sex laws which govern herself, and they will not be uniform or written into statutes as they are now. Every woman will be a law unto herself . . . . to substantiate my statements I refer to the leading spokeswomen of the Feminist movement, i. e. Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Ellen Key, Emma Goldman, Mrs. C. G. Hartley, and to Bernard Shaw and Ibsen."

Every name that this writer mentions to substantiate her statement as to the immoral doctrines of Feminism is the name of a Suffragist who either speaks for the Suffrage cause or

whose writings are recommended or published and circulated by the National Suffrage Association.

"The Case For Woman Suffrage" a bibliography of Suffrage literature published by the College Equal Suffrage League and sold by the National Woman Suffrage Association sneers at the "old-fashioned" Suffrage arguments and gives the highest of praise to the radical writings of the most radical Feminists and Socialists.

"Too many advocates of Woman Suffrage," says The Case (page 164) "insist that when woman is enfranchised she will be no less 'womanly' than before, whereas in point of fact perhaps the chief thing to be said for the Suffrage is precisely that it will make woman less womanly in the commonly accepted sense of the term—One cannot argue logically on Woman Suffrage without facing this fact."

The devotees of Feminism talk glibly and coarsely about "sex equality" and "sex freedom" and "sex independence," all to be achieved with the vote.

When we remember that women are today free to do anything men are permitted to do under the law of God or Man, we can understand what they mean by this coveted "equality" or "freedom" or "independence, that is to "spiritualize and broaden" the good women of our land.

HARVARD PROFESSOR CONDEMNS SUFFRAGE

Sees No Improvement Where Women Vote, But Menace to Family Group and Interests.

Professor Thomas N. Carver, of Harvard University, author of "Sociology and Social Progress," and of "The Distribution of Wealth," and widely known throughout the country for his work as special investigator for the Government under the Department of Agriculture, was the principal speaker at the recent annual meeting of the Cambridge Anti-Suffrage Association. Professor Carver said in part:

"Woman suffrage is not of great importance in itself. It is only a straw that shows which way the wind of public opinion is blowing. That wind seems to be blowing toward individualism. The tendency is to make the individual the unit, rather than the family group. If it is true that the interests of the individuals making up the family group are not identical but conflicting,

then of course, each individual should have a vote to protect his own interests—the husband, to protect his against the wife; the wife, to protect hers against the husband. But are the interests of men and women conflicting? Are they competitive? Are they not rather complementary? Bread and butter do not compete—bread on the contrary, creates a demand for butter. Lime and sand do not compete—the making of lime creates a demand for sand. The difference between men and women, and the need of each for the other, tends to identity of interests not conflict.

The tendency to individualism is an unwholesome one. The idea that marriage is an arrangement which concerns no one but the two individuals first involved, and that human beings may mate and re-mate as the birds do, is unfavorable to the interests of children. John Fiske has shown strikingly that the long, dependent infancy of the human species points to permanent marriage and monogamy. For the best development of the human stock, the family must be a permanent entity. Social organization must take this into account and fit it into its system. To assume that this entity does not exist is the way to secure its disintegration."

The speaker said that if he thought better government would result from extending the suffrage or restricting it, he would favor either such change. He would be willing to follow the argument for woman suffrage to its logical conclusion. If the quality of the vote is improved by giving women the ballot, then women must be better voters than men, and not only should women be enfranchised but men should be disfranchised. But there is no evidence that woman suffrage produces better government. The suffragists aften match the name of Jane Addams against that of some conspicious criminal or degenerate and say, "Don't you think she would make a better voter than he?" It is a shallow question, but it can be appropriately answered by matching the name of Dr. Eliot against that of some notorious female criminal and asking whether his vote would be improved by adding hers. There is no proof that women have improved conditions where they vote. The testimony of governors and other officials who have been elected by women's votes counts very little. States where women do not vote lead in prohibition, child-labor reforms and industrial legislation. In woman suffrage states, where the novelty has worn off, women take less interest in voting than men do.

It is a false theory which teaches that voting is a privilege, and a bad state of politics results from it. Voting is a duty, as

working on roads is a duty in rural communities, and as paying taxes is a duty. A man or woman who regards the vote as a privilege is not fit to vote.

OBJECTIONS TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Extracts from Mrs. Weatherbee's Anti-Suffrage Campaign Manual. Edited by Maybelle Stuard.

ELEVEN REASONS WHY WOMEN SHOULD OPPOSE WOMAN SUFFRAGE

1. The proportion of women actively engaged in, or inactively supporting the suffrage movement is so small a minority of the adult female population as to conclusively prove that the great majority of women are either opposed or indifferent to the franchise.

2. Of this large majority there is a certain portion which has given thought and consideration to the matter and, after due investigation and examination, has decided that woman suffrage would be detrimental to the best interests of the State

3. These women, who constitute the active members of the Anti-Suffrage majority, have realized that strength lies in organization and, therefore, they have formed themselves into societies to engage in active preventive measures.

4. The Anti-Suffrage women realize that if they remain indifferent or inactive in the expression of their views, they are liable to be misunderstood as acquiescing in the wishes of the suffrage minority and that, unless they protest against woman suffrage, it will be forced upon them by the belief of the voters that they desire it.

5. They know that if suffrage be granted to women they will be forced, against their desires, opinions and beliefs, into active political life, for, unless they take up the full civic burdens so thrust upon them, they will be represented (or rather misrepresented) by the minority, constituted of the pro-suffrage voters.

6. They appreciate fully the burden of the civic duties that will devolve upon them if woman suffrage be granted and they protest against the addition of this burden to those which Nature has imposed upon them in the characteristics of sex.

7. They know that suffrage carries with it not only electoral duties but the responsibilities of office. They know that the

right of the ballot entails the duty of public service in the three branches of government, and they appreciate that the biological characteristics of the female sex disqualify women from constant and continual performance of such service.

8. They are firmly convinced that woman suffrage will be inexpedient and detrimental to the best interests of the community; that it will increase the expense of the government, and raise the tax rate to meet this increase; that it will be an economic waste, as it will withdraw women from the specialized employments for which they are eminently fitted, and add to their labors those of political exertions; and that it will increase the dangers of unintelligent legislation through the more powerful organization of the least intelligent members of the voting body.

9. They believe that the whole purpose of progress and evolution is that of differentiation and specialization, and see in the leveling of both sexes to the same activities of life nothing but retrogression.

10. They believe that expression of desire by persons disqualified by nature from enforcing the results of such expression is not only futile but dangerous.

11. And, as free-born and patriotic American citizens, they protest against being burdend with responsibilities they do not want, and which they are unfitted to support, merely to please a small minority of their sex, most of whom do not know why they wish the franchise, what they will do with it when they get it, nor whether it will be an agent for good or evil, if they do obtain it.

WHY WOMEN VOTE IN SOME STATES

Small numbers of strenuous advocates, having one purpose in view and working continuously and exclusively to attain that end, often succeed through the support of the indifferent, in foisting the desires of a small minority upon a large majority of their opponents.

This is particularly true of the woman suffrage movement in the United States. In none of the states in which women have been given full suffrage have the majority of the people wanted it. In fact, the greater proportion of the women themselves have not desired it. But a small body of intensive and fanatical women have, through gaining the apathetic vote by showy arguments, false war cries, and continuous strenuous endeavor, forced their

wishes upon the whole body of citizens. One has only to glance at the election returns whereby woman suffrage amendments have been granted to prove this statement. The great state of California granted it by a majority of 3,587 in 1911, Oregon by 4,161 in 1912, and Nevada by 3,678 in 1914

The first general demand of the woman suffrage promoters was for the school vote and this was granted in many states because it was deemed expedient to test women's interest in the ballot by giving them the power to vote for those who should control the institutions in which their children are educated. The history of the woman's vote in school elections was a great disappointment to the suffragists, as it showed that women were not sufficiently interested to go to the polls, save in a very slight proportion. But, despite this fact, the small body of suffragists next demanded the right of women to municipal suffrage and where this was granted, the results were similar to those of the school elections. Like the proverbial camel nosing his way into the tent, they kept on and demanded full suffrage. In 1869 the sparsely settled territory of Wyoming, with a population of 9,000 persons, had granted its women the franchise and its example was followed by Colorado in 1893, and then gradually in a period of twenty years nine other states followed these examples, and anyone who has taken the trouble to investigate carefully and impartially the results of double suffrage in those states can find nothing to recommend its extension to other localities.

It is useless for the suffragists to claim that it has worked successfully in the states granting it because prominent business men and politicians refuse to condemn it and often advocate it. Who can believe that such men can afford to tell the truth when by so doing they would lose their private commercial interests or their public offices? No man in a double suffrage state is likely to give utterances to expressions which will gain him boycott or dismissal.

MARRIED WOMEN AND THE BALLOT

Of these 16,500,000 women of voting age, about 75.5 per cent are married. The married woman can vote only in one of two ways. She can either vote the same as does her husband, and thus double his vote, or she can vote in opposition to him and thus cancel his vote, and in so doing disenfranchise the family. If doubling of the husband's vote is a benefit, it would be an

economic saving in time and labor to grant every married man two votes, rather than to give one each to husband and wife.

But there can be no question of any benefit to either party in the disenfranchisement of the family, which is the unit of our social life and the very foundation of stable society and modern civilization. With manhood suffrage, the family has representation. With double suffrage it is liable to be entirely without representation.

The thinking, reasoning married woman should oppose an innovation which tends to bring political discord within the family and which will certainly cause extra exertion and endeavor, probably without requisite compensation.

The Single Women and the Ballot.

As for the unmarried women, who represent the 24.5 per cent of women of voting age, and include the spinisters, widows, and divorced, there seems to be no real benefit that can come to them through the ballot. There appears to be nothing beneficial which they can procure with the vote that is not already guaranteed to them under the law.

The unmarried woman today has, under the law all the rights and privileges that the unmarried man has in the protection of life and property and the pursuit of happiness. The lack of the franchise is compensated by exemption from jury, riot, and military duty.

To be sure, some single women pay taxes, just as every owner of property pays taxes, but it should always be remembered that it is not the woman who is taxed, but the property which she owns. Taxes are imposed for the maintenance of government and in return for the taxes paid the property receives protection. Minors, aliens, corporations, and residents of the District of Columbia pay taxes, but none of these taxpayers vote, nor do they demand the ballot upon their taxpaying qualification.

Therefore, what benefit can a single woman expect to derive from the franchise unless she desire the privilege of holding electoral office? There are plenty of offices already that women may hold, but these offices are the useful, inconspicuous and unexciting positions, rather than those attended by gold lace and civic ornamentation.

Wage Earning Women. In almost every suffrage speech, no matter how short it may be, the working girl and the wage-earning woman are featured, and the audience is told that 8,000,000 working women in the United States need the ballot

to protect themselves in industry and secure higher wages. Let us investigate the figures given.

The only authoritative source for such figures is the United States Census, and the volume dealing with "Occupations" in the compilation of 1910 furnishes food for thought on this subject. Working women are classified in the Census of "females gainfully employed" and this term covers every female 10 years of age and over who is employed in any fashion which brings remuneration for labor, whether her whole time be given to partial employment in the home, so long as such employment produces monetary income.

The Census of 1910 states that there are in the United States 34,552,712 females of ten years of age and over, and that of these females, 8,075,772, or 23 per cent are gainfully employed. Of this latter number 2,530,846, or 22.3 per cent are in domestic or personal service, 1,309,549 or 16.2 per cent being servants. The classification ranking next in size is that of agriculture and stock raising which numbers 1,807,501, or 22.3 per cent of those gainfully employed, of which number 1,514,423, or 18.7 percent are farm laborers. Thus, of the 8,075,772 females gainfully employed in the country 4,333,347, or 53.6 per cent are engaged in service or farming.

Females employed in manfacturing and mechanical industries number 1,106,791, or only 13.4 per cent while professional women, including teachers and nurses, number 733,885 or only 9 per cent, and those engaged in trade, including clerks in stores and saleswomen, number 468,088, or only 5.5 per cent. Women engaged in transportation, including telegraph and telephone operators, number 106,596, or 1.3, and women in clerical positions, including agents, canvassers, stenographers and typewriters number 393,224, or 7.3 per cent. Of professional women there are 11,992 actors, 9,015 physicians and surgeons, 685 clergymen, 558 lawyers, 13,287 artists, including teachers of drawing, and 1,220 fortune tellers, hypnotists, spirit mediums, etc.

Having surveyed these figures, let us consider of what benefit the ballot will be to these women for whom the suffragists are asking it. First, of the whole 8,075,772 "females gainfully employed" 2,484,683, or 30.6 per cent are under twenty-one years of age and thus could not use the ballot were woman suffrage universal throughout the country. Furthermore, if Illinois, with its partial woman suffrage be included, 918,319 of

them already enjoy the blessings of the ballot, as they live within the woman suffrage states.

Even the suffragists themselves claim little benefit from the vote for domestic servants, and the large farming class being mostly composed of negro women in the southern cotton fields, would still remain unenfranchised by the electoral laws of those states in which they reside. Deducting also those who would be excluded as of foreign birth, we have only about 2,000,000 women "gainfully employed" of voting age, by whom the ballot might be used, but of what real benefit would its use be to them? Would equal political rights with men give the working women better protection in health and industry, or increase their wages?

A comparison of conditions in states where women do not vote with those in which they do is the only reasonable answer. If we find that in woman suffrage states, working women are better off in these matters, we might have some reason to suppose that the ballot has had some measure of influence in producing such improvement. But, if, on the other hand we find women better off in man suffrage states, we have no proof of the beneficent power of the vote.

As a matter of fact, there is no law for the protection of the working woman in any woman suffrage state that is not equaled or surpassed in some man suffrage state, and many of the laws on the statute books of the woman suffrage states that protect the working woman were passed by their respective legislatures before women were enfranchised. Many woman suffrage states fall far below the standard set by the man suffrage states in legislation affecting women. For instance, while twenty-seven states restrict the number of hours during which a woman may be employed both by the day and week, Utah and Arizona, are the only states which passed such laws under double suffrage, and Wyoming, where women have had full suffrage for forty-six years, places no limit whatever to the length of time a woman may be employed. Prohibition of night work, which is considered by social workers as the perfection of industrial remedial legislation, is not found on the statute books of any double suffrage state.

As to the increase of wages, even suffragists must admit that the wage rate depends upon the eternal laws of demand and supply. Votes cannot make work when there is no work. Neither can votes increase wages when there is no natural increase in business or shortage of labor.

For the professional woman, there seems to be no benefit to be derived from the ballot that she cannot enjoy without it. Today, all professions are open to women and the avenues to the highest professional education are unbarred. Save for those 553 ladies of the legal profession who may hope to achieve political office from the franchise, there appears to be no gain for this body of women through the power of casting a vote at the polls The 11,992 actresses are so seldom at their legal residence on election day that they would practically be unable to use the right and the other professional women could gain nothing as a body which cannot be secured to them by their male confreres. There is nothing in the history of the double suffrage states to promise any benefit to school teachers when we remember that there are no teachers' pension systems in Wyoming, where women have voted for forty-six years, nor in Idaho, where they have voted for nineteen years. In Utah, where women were enfranchised in 1896, the legislature of 1913 provided for a retirement commission, but up to date the organization has not been effected, while Washington, with Woman Suffrage, voted down the teachers' retirement fund bill at the polls in November, 1914, by a majority of 193,305!

If woman suffrage has not granted better laws for working women and cannot increase their wages, of what benefit can it be to them when it entails the possibility of removing the privileges they already enjoy and laying them under constant contribution to campaign funds, and the necessity of supporting political burdens? It has no known power for their betterment and has many potential possibilities for their injury. The known advantages of man suffrage are better than the unknown disadvantages of woman suffrage to the working women, and, therefore, they should oppose granting the suffrage to women.

WHY A MAN SHOULD OPPOSE WOMAN SUFFRAGE

First, because only a small minority of women ask for the suffrage. Those who do are clamorous, and they keep themselves well in the limelight; but they speak for only a small part of their sex. Witness the very suggestive fact that the suffragists always oppose any proposal to submit to women themselves the question whether suffrage should be given them. They have fought proposals of this kind in the Legislatures of New York, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Indiana, and other states; and it cannot have been forgotten how bitterly they opposed the Drury bill in Massachusetts Legislature. They know well that there

could be no shorter road to suffrage than to demonstrate that women want it; and if they thought there was the ghost of a chance that a poll of women would show a suffrage majority, they would welcome it.

A second reason why a man should oppose woman suffrage is that to thrust it upon women, the great majority of whom do not want it, is to impose a heavy burden upon a sex already sufficiently weighted with responsibilities. The average woman has already as heavy a load as she can well carry. The strenuous conditions of modern life are not making it any lighter. It is impossible to relieve her of this load, but why needlessly add to it? Shallow suffragists proclaim that voting is a trifling matter, which can be attended to on the way to market. But men know that if votes are to be cast so lightly, and with so little thought, they would better not be cast at all. Women cannot better politics unless, as a sex, they will vote more inteligently, more steadily, and more public-spiritedly than men. But to expect them to do this without slighting existing responsibilities is expecting a great deal.

A third reason why a man should oppose woman suffrage is that the results, where the experiment has been tried for years, do not justify extending it. True, some suffragists keep on enumerating the evils of every sort, which will be done away as soon as women are given the vote. But the more candid suffragists are not only abandoning the claim of a "moral uplift" through the votes of women, but are asking angrily why it should be expected. Thus Mrs. D. Bryant Turner, in the "Denver Republican," asks why women should be expected to purify politics and adds: "Although it is very flattering, the fact is that women are no better than men along any lines;" and no less a person than Judge Lindsey, although he has since tried to explain away his meaning, put himself on record in "Everybody's Magazine" for May, 1910, thus: "If anyone believes that woman's suffrage is a panacea for all the evils of our political life, he does not know what those evils are. The women are as free of the power of the Beast as men are, and no freer."

A fourth reason why a man should oppose woman suffrage is that the suffrage movement is closely allied with Socialism. Not that all suffragists are Socialists, but that all Socialists are suffragists and are counting eagerly upon being reinforced at the polls by women's votes. It is a fact of no little moment that, in the suffrage parade in New York, the Socialists had their recognized place in the procession, the red flag followed the

yellow, and the Socialist banners bore the inscription "Every Socialist, is a suffragist." Also, the forces of evil are quick to organize their sort of women. This is what is already being openly done by the "wets" in Illinois; and A. J. Cormack, one of their leaders, said: "Now that suffrage is a reality, we shall organize our women, and expect to have no difficulty in getting results at the polls."

One more reason may be mentioned why a man should oppose woman suffrage. It is this: That the outcome of women's voting will be either to bring about the same result at the polls, or to bring about a different result. If the former, we shall double the voting lists and double election expenses and put a heavy and undesired burden upon women, without accomplishing anything whatever. If the latter, we shall override the majority of men by the votes of a minority of men plus a majority of women. It requires no prophet to predict into what chaos that would lead us.

Three Suffrage Arguments.

The advocates of woman suffrage base all their arguments on three fundamental assertions, namely—that suffrage is a right that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that no one should be taxed who cannot vote.

Unfortunately, for the suffrage cause, these assertions are fallacies. Suffrage is not a right, governments do not derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and taxation has no connection with the franchise.

There are only two kinds of "rights"—natural rights and legal rights. For a right to be a natural right, it must be one which becomes operative upon the birth of the individual and remains so until his death, such as the right to life, which is a natural right and is so recognized by the law, which endeavors to protect the individual in this right, even before birth. If suffrage were a natural right every child would have this right from birth and during his minority would be allowed to exercise the right through guardian or proxy, as he is allowed to exercise his property right.

Suffrage is only a legal right, when it is bestowed through legal action, and suffragists have never disputed the authority of a legislative body, as representatives of the people, to enfranchise women through legal channels. In this recognition of authority, the suffragists also recognize the right of the same bodies to refuse such legislation or to repeal it. A right that can

be granted or repealed by act of legislature is purely a legal right, and not a natural, because a natural right cannot be affected by such action.

Suffrage is not a privilege granted for the benefit of the individual, but a duty imposed for the benefit of the state. Government is not operated for the personal welfare of each individual unit, but for the welfare of the majority of these units, composing the commonwealth. Therefore, it is the right of the state to decide what type of individuals shall compose its electorate, as best suited to guarantee its welfare, and to establish such qualifications as it deems necessary to ensure the ability of such an electorate to perpetuate the welfare of the state.

Government does not derive its just powers from the consent of all the governed, but from the consent of the majority of the governed, otherwise elections would be futile; for if one were not obliged to recognize or obey a law in which he had no voice in making, the defeated minority at every election would be justified in refusing to recognize the will of the majority—which is anarchy. Likewise, every time a new voter were added to the electorate, either through attainment of majority, or naturalization, or change of residence it would be necessary to have a reenactment of every law, that he might register his approval of the same. On such an argument, all persons not included in the electorate, such as aliens or minors, would have a perfect right to decline recognition of any law that did not suit their individual fancies, or did not accord with their personal interests or wishes.

The laws under which we live to day are many of them of very ancient origin, tracing their ancestry back through the old common law of England, to the ancient laws of Rome, with side branches to the codes of the Franks and Teutons. Many cases today are decided on precedents established many centuries before the contestants were born. Yet. were we to admit this fallacy of consent of the governed, we should have to abandon all such precedents and re-enact annually our code for the benefit of the new batch of voters that attain their majority each year. If such action were required, the granting of woman suffrage would produce pandemonium, for in doubling the electorate, the new half would be at liberty to refuse recognition of all laws passed before its enfranchisement and could demand a new enactment of every statute, with a period of anarchy and riot during the interim. All of which merely shows how perfectly absurd such an argument is. It might also be added that children, aliens,

and incompetents should have a vote for the simple reason that they are governed.

"Taxation without representation is tyranny," shout the suffrage orators, and think they have supplied the unimpeachable argument for votes-for-women. In converting this utterance of James Otis into the present catch phrase of the suffrage propaganda, its users have entirely ignored its original meaning and have perverted it to signify that no person should be taxed for any purpose who does not derive a direct and personal benefit from the expenditure of the money collected from such taxation, and that it is an axiom of government that no person shall pay a tax of any kind without a personal direction in the use of the said tax.

It should be unnecessary to tell anyone who has a knowledge of the history of this country that the originator of this phrase referred to special taxes instituted by the British Parliament on its American colonials, without allowing them to send a representative to that legislative body,—and was entirely without allusion to any right of suffrage.

Taxes are not instituted for the sole purpose of legislative accomplishment, and in this country there is no connection between the ownership of property and the franchise. The establishment of universal manhood suffrage in this country was not based on the property right, but arose from the idea that those who bore arms should vote.

Many persons paying no taxes whatever have the right to vote, and many persons paying large taxes are not allowed this right, and very properly, otherwise, minor children, aliens, idiots or any incorporated body would be allowed the voting power on no other qualification than that of owning property—which would hardly be a wise basis upon which to rear any suffrage structure.

Taxes are imposed for the payment of the maintenance of government from which all are supposed to share the benefits either directly or indirectly; and in case of unusual need for special funds special taxes are imposed for special wants, such as the revenue tax imposed upon commercial paper during the Spanish War, and yet no clamor was then heard from the vast army of cheque users for the voting privilege on this ground.

Taxes are imposed to support schools, maintain and illuminate roads, afford fire and police protection, grant sewage and water systems, and provide for the care of criminals, insane, and paupers, and for many other matters as well as for the legisla-

tive, executive, and judicial departments of government. It is as sensible to say that a man or woman should not be taxed to support these last three named institutions of government, unless he can vote to control them, as that he shall be free from the former unless he derive a direct benefit from the same. Shall a man refuse to pay for schools, if he have no children to send to them, or for fire protection if he have no house to burn, or for police protection, because he carries a gun or an accident policy? Everyone will agree that this is absurd, and yet it is no more so than a woman shall refuse to pay her income tax unless she be permitted to vote for president.

If the payment of taxes be a qualification for suffrage, we must allow every owner of property a vote in every community in which he owns property and pays corresponding taxes, and one voter could cast a ballot in every town wherein his property is situated—every criminal, minor, mental defective, or alien must be given representation, while any intelligent person of no matter how much knowledge or virtue shall be deprived of the voting privilege unless he hold a tax receipt.

If taxes be confused with suffrage, and the franchise be asked for every taxpayer, the logical sequence is to ask that the expression of the vote shall be in proportion to the amount of the tax paid. Thus, the payer of the poll tax only, should have the right to vote on minor questions, while the corporation, paying large taxes, should have a vote in greater proportion. Minors and aliens also should have the franchise through guardians and proxies, if this relation between taxation and suffrage be correct.

The attitude of basing suffrage on property has been abandoned for many years and the idea of government based upon wealth and the control of riches passed away with feudalism, and there is little likelihood that this country which legally recognizes no class distinctions nor rank of birth or wealth in its political and official economy, will ever return to this feudal idea of the middle ages.

Furthermore, the fact is that in every state there are more taxpaying men than taxpaying women, and if taxation be a qualification for suffrage, what is the logic in enormously increasing the non-taxpaying vote, by the addition of the great number of non-taxpaying females?

Force and the Ballot.

The fact that political power and the respect for political

authority is ensured only by the force which can sustain such authority, has been a recognized axiom of government since the dawn of history. In all human communities, from the most savage to the most highly civilized, the only power that is really respected is the power of force. No government is possible that cannot enforce its mandates, for unless the laws can be sustained by physical action, they will at once become inoperative through the failure of the means to command their obedience. It is upon this axiom that the corollary of the rule by the majority rests. It is the knowledge of the defeated minority that it is outnumbered in fighting units by the victorious majority which forces its submission to the will of the latter.

Therefore, unless every woman can be regarded as a fighting unit, her ballot is practically useless against that of a man, unless she have the physical force to back her wishes.

Unhappily for the suffragist faction, ages ago Nature decided that man should be the combatant of the human species and not the woman. There may be submissive men and bellicose women, but when the average is drawn the preponderance of force is found in the human male and not in the human female.

The idea of universal manhood suffrage grew in this country from the early immigrant days, when every man carried a musket to protect his family, his life, and his property from the aboriginal American savage. Every man was the unit of an army, every man carried arms, therefore, it was reasoned that in the government which was to decide upon the matters of offense and defense, every man should be entitled to one vote. It was the rule of one musket, one ballot, and there was no idea of property consideration or tax rate involved. Men were liable for their taxes to support the maintenance of government, and the property paid the tax; but men were liable to draft to fight savages and suppress riots. Women pay the same taxes as men, but are exempt from the personal service tax by reason of their sex.

Suffragists may ridicule this fact to their hearts' content, but it is a fact, nevertheless. They may proclaim that on this basis all men that would be refused admission to the country's armed forces should be deprived of the ballot. But these similes are superficial. While it is true that all men cannot bear arms at every period of life, extreme youth, extreme age, and temporary physical incompetence preventing, it is a fact that during the life of the average man there is a long period during which he is fit to bear arms, and, all the viragos and furies and

bellicose females to the contrary, the physique of the average woman does not permit of the hardships of war.

As for the age limit and the physical qualifications of men for service, they change according to the stress and demand for fighting men. During the first part of our Civil War men were rejected in both north and south who were later accepted, and while in the early days only the flower of southern manhood entered the army, toward the end of the war the Confederacy issued the draft for all men from fifteen to old age, capable of caerying a musket. As the danger increases the qualifications decrease and no man can ever safely state that he is free from the liability of forced service.

Is it advisable to grant woman a ballot to express wishes that she is powerless to enforce, and to vote on measures that may result in the call for troops? Will a majority of women ever be able to carry a foreign or civil war measure and force the burden of fighting upon a minority of males?

The British suffragists proclaim that women are as capable of fighting as men and have endeavored by physical force to show their prowess in the fight and bring their wishes to the notice of the authorities. But, these misguided, wrong-headed, hysterical, and, in many cases, mentally unbalanct women, constantly take advantage of their sex immunity from physical retaliation to perpetrate outrages that would not be allowed from any man. It is an axiom of civilized society that a woman may perpetrate an attack but shall not be attackt, that even in self defense she shall be immune from violence and the very women who are vaunting their courage in insulting and attacking men are relying upon the innate chivalry of the human male to absolve them from their just deserts. How long do you suppose the London bobbies would allow struggling, scratching, clawing, howling men to rough them before they applied sticks to heads? How long would the authorities regard hunger strikes in males? When Albert Davis, under sentence for theft went on a hunger strike in October of 1913, he was allowed to die and the coroner's jury returned a verdict of "death from natural causes." The courage of the wild woman is the cowardly bravado of the virago based on her sense of security.

Feminism.

Feminism is an unpleasant subject to investigate or discuss, but one that is thrust upon us by the affiliation of its promoters and supporters with woman suffrage. Far be it from me to say

that every woman suffragist is a feminist, but every feminist is a woman suffragist, because the feminists see in the women's votes an engine for the propulsion of their theories into the body politic. Norman Hapgood declared that suffrage is but an incident in the (feminist) movement, and the vote is only a symbol of woman's new activity and new interest in the world. "The movement means," he continues, "a rearrangement of the intellectual and moral forces of society to the end that hereafter civilization is to be the composite ideals of the two sexes, both free, instead of the expression of one sex and the domination of the other."

Female suffrage is merely one means toward an end and, as the feminists frankly admit in their numerous published statements and their official organ, "The Freewoman," besides many monographs and brochures, it is only the entering wedge which from a small opening shall force asunder the present conditions of society until the whole fabric of the contemporary civilization shall be shattered and a new social system be raised upon its ruins.

The subversion of any organized society, and especially one of great variety in its interwoven units is a period of terror. The transition state from one recognized and established condition to another is one always fraught with danger. It is a period in which the frenzy of the radical and unbalanced is seeking new outlets and always abounds with absurd and insane "isms." A condition of chaos pertains that is detrimental to all orders of society and during the boiling of the pot, the scum rises, crime increases and unbridled license holds sway. Nor do the feminists deny that such may very probably be the result of their teachings, and they rather expect it than otherwise—a general conflagration of the present world upon which they shall raise a new heaven and a new earth.

But the ruin of the social structure is pure anarchy and the alliance of the woman suffrage movement with the anarchcists and feminists shows that they are to be cataloged in the same class. Some suffragists have shown a likeness to the anarchists, and the militant suffragettes have adopted no other methods than those of the anarchist propaganda. The red flag has its position and its quota of followers in suffrage parades, and "Votes for women" is another slogan for anarchy. It is a grave political question of these United States at the present time—and of greater importance to our future as a nation than any other problem of the day—whether this wedge be allowed

admission when the desired object of its intrusion is a political revolution and a social upheaval, with a view to the abolition of present social conditions and the paramount supremacy of the female portion of mankind, with the consequent suppression of the male.

The feminists, while unanimously advocating the advance of woman in all spheres and her final superiority to man, are divided in the minor details of their desires. Some advocate merely the absolute equality of women in responsibilities and privileges, affirming that women are capable of performing every function of the male, save one, and that they are capable of entering the employments and industries now considered as outside their capacity on account of sex. They assert that women and men should be absolutely equal to the extent of being identical, that chivalry and the instinctive protective attitude of the male is all wrong, and that men and women should compete in every phase of life, and that the present marriage relations should be abolished as out of date.

Some do not go so far as to advocate the abolition of all legal marriage, but do state that both parents should be responsible for the support of the offspring and that wives, to be free and independent, must be income producing. Others would abolish all marriage, allow the women to select the fathers of their children in temporary association, and demand of the state the support and education of the children.

There is an extreme group of feminists who go to the length of proclaiming man so inferior to woman that the male should only be maintained for biological functions, with the latest and most advanced practices of the stockfarm. In fact, there is a group which seems to believe that the model for society is to be found in apiaries, and consider that these communities have given the last word in social progress. They look forward with longing to the time when society shall consist of a large proportion of sexually atrophied workers, a few selected and segregated mothers, and a small number of drones.

But to whatever group of feminists the speaker may belong the assertion is always made that female suffrage is not the end, but merely the means, together with the declaration that it is only the engine for the production of social evolution. They do not deny that such revolution will result in chaotic conditions and that during the period of transition, fanatical frenzy will run riot, but they consider that any cost is worth paying if only women can rule supreme.

Woman Suffrage and Prohibition.

There is no connection whatever between woman suffrage and prohibition, and the sooner advocates of total abstinence are disabused of the idea that the two belong together, the sooner will they be able to judge with impartiality the great question of the advisability of granting votes to women.

Women, like men, whether they be suffrage advocates, suffrage opponents, or indifferent toward the enfranchisement of women, are divided upon the subject of prohibition.

The returns of the last election show that while many women voted for prohibition in those states in which the referendum went to the people, many women also voted against it.

The woman suffrage states of Arizona, Colorado, Oregon, and Washington entered the dry list, while California defeated prohibition by a tremendous majority.

Until this election no woman suffrage state was dry save Kansas, which went dry many years before women voted, and yet women have been enfranchised for forty-five years in Wyoming, twenty years in Colorado, and eighteen and nineteen respectively in Utah and Idaho.

During this period, we find that under male suffrage the following states have gone dry: Georgia, Kansas, Maine Mississippi, North Carolina, North Dakota Oklahoma, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. And many of these states are regarded as overwhelmingly opposed to the enfranchisement of women.

It is impossible to prophesy that woman suffrage means future prohibition from any result of the votes of women in the past. Some suffragists declare that the liquor interests have nothing to fear from the woman vote.

The plain truth of the matter is that those women who believe in prohibition will support it at the polls while those who do not will vote against it, and those who have a vital interest in the matter will not allow the conditions of the weather or personal comfort to keep them from registering their views.

One of the vital interests of present society is personal income. Therefore, one may safely believe that all womn who derive commercial benefit, either directly or indirectly, from the liquor business will not fail to vote on the question. The prohibition women "may" vote, but the female relatives and friends of every man benefited by the liquor traffic "will" vote, and these votes will be solidly wet.

The question of the advisability of prohibition is one of the

personal opinion which women who vote register their own views on the subject, exactly as do men, and in no other way.

There are plenty of issues involved in the question of votes for women without any one wasting time on the fallacy that woman suffrage and prohibition are akin, and the opponents of the measure can agree with the majority of suffragists on this point, at least, that there is no connection between suffrage and prohibition.

WHO ORIGINATED THE SOCIAL WELFARE LAWS

Every one of the following kinds of legislation was first conceived and advocated by men, and first enacted by male legislators elected by the votes of men alone:

Limiting the hours of women in industry and prohibiting the employment of women too soon before and after childbirth.

Compensating widows and children of workmen killd in industry.

Securing the property rights of married women.

Red-light abatement laws, and laws against white slave traffic.

Providing for effective birth registration (A law essential to the reduction of infant mortality).

Limiting child labor and establishing juvenile courts.

All of these laws have not even yet been passt by woman suffrage states.

EIGHT ARGUMENTS AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

1. The vote is not a question of individual right, or what is best for the individual, or for any class, but solely a question of what is best for the state.

2. The net result of woman suffrage wherever tried has been a loss to the state and a loss to women.

3. The vote is demanded by only a small minority of the women.

4. To force the vote upon the great majority to satisfy a small minority would be undemocratic and unjust.

5. Men and women were created different and designd to work in different spheres for the common good; to cooperate with and supplement each other and not to compete.

6. The vote would deprive woman of her non-partisan pow-

er, which enables her to do for the State what man is unable to do, because he is bound by political party obligations.

7. The basis of government is physical force, and the physical force to enforce the law without which the vote is useless, is neither possible nor desirable for women.

8. Woman suffrage is demanded by socialists and feminists as a means to an end, the end being a complete social revolution.

DIGESTS OF VARIOUS ARTICLES

Three tailors of Tooley Street once petitioned the British Parliament as, "We, the people of United Kingdom," etc.

The combined majorities of the states who have voted in favor of woman suffrage total 199,214. The combined majorities in the states which have voted against it total 1,346,597.

If women demand the ballot in addition to their present privileges they are not fair to the men; if they do not retain their present privileges they are unfair to their children and to the race.

The term, "Woman's Rights,, is question-begging. Everybody believes in giving women their rights. We believe in giving dogs their rights. We are admonisht to give even the Devil his due. The question is, "What are woman's rights."

The real question is not what women want, but what is best for the state; for the homes; for the children, for society as a whole. The very name "woman's rights" gives it away. What is best for the nation as a whole is best for women.

If the affirmative is candid they will admit that a creature who will wear the modern high heeld shoes is lacking in the practical sense which voters ought to have. Those who are controld more by fashion than by sense are poor material for voters.

It would probably be unfair to hold all suffragists responsible for all the opinions held by free lovers socialists, feminists, etc., but there is no denying the fact that they keep that kind of company, or at least that that kind of company comes to them.

Woman suffrage has only been tried long enuf to tell anything about it in a few sparsely settled states. How it works in states where there are more than twice as many men as women is no criterion of how it would work in states where there are more women than men.

Woman's physical handicaps put her to a great disadvantage in competing with men. It is far more reasonable to make

the lives of men and women supplementary as much as possible; a cooperative instead of a competitive struggle in which men would have the advantage.

Women are now exempt from the army and navy, and are rarely blacksmiths, hod-carriers, section hands, or workers in machine shops, foundries, etc. Absolute equality with men would involve more than many suffragists desire, and more than the welfare of the race could permit.

Women are physically weaker than men. It may be regretted but it is a fact. It may be that the Creator made a mistake, but if so, it is now too late to remedy it. But if women were as rough and clumsy as men it would be hard on babies, to say the least. The existing plan has its advantages.

The first legislation put thru in both Colorado and in California after the adoption of woman suffrage was a law which excusd women from telling their ages when they went to register. Did they think that women cared so little for the ballot that they would rather not vote than tell their age?

It is common to hear men say, "Well if women want the ballot, let them have it; I do not like to deprive them of it if they greatly desire it; but am very strongly of the opinion that women will lose far more than they will gain by it." The vote for woman suffrage does not reflect the real opinion.

Colored women outnumber white women in Mississippi and South Carolina, and 29 counties in Virginia, and over 60 counties in Georgia. Colored women are far less illiterate than colored men so the illiteracy test would not protect as now. National woman suffrage means negro domination in many counties in the South.

Colorado, the second state in the Union to adopt woman suffrage, weakens and nullifies its child labor laws to a greater extent than any other state in the Union except Mississippi, Colorado children who work in the sugar beet fields are worse off than the pickaninnies who pick cotton in the southern cotton fields.

The affirmative make much of the testimonials of politicians, legislatures, etc., where Woman Suffrage has been adopted. It is perfectly evident that any man voting against such a resolution would be committing political suicide. What is man's testimony worth in such a case? No court would give such testimony full credence.

Among the most disgraceful scenes enacted in modern history were the antics of the suffragists in England, breaking

windows, attacking men with all kinds of villification and abuse when they appeared in public, mobbing the House of Commons etc. If they had been men doing such things they would have been sent to the penitentiary.

Women now receive deference and courtesy from all normal men. Men lift their hats not to women but to womanhood. Could women expect to retain this deference while engaged in rough and tumble competition with men? And how could men be as able to serve her if he retained the desire to? Could woman hope to gain as much by suffrage as she would lose?

It is a fact that cannot be denied that the general attitude of suffragists at the beginning of the Great War was in opposition to it. Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, one of the chief leaders said as late as 1916, that the American flag was a piece of bunting, and that "America does not need military and industrial preparedness if it is prepard to live within its own borders."

Many women have no opportunity to marry; should their fate be aggravated by refusal of citizenship? Such lives are a tragedy, often, but in the effort to mitigate their lot shall we tempt other women from the highest destiny the world knows? How could it help those who are denied children and home to sacrifice the homes and children of other women.

Buying and selling votes is a recognized business in Colorado cities. It is so prevalent that little or no attempt is made to put a stop to it. Not only that, but the women sell their votes cheaper than the men do. Where the prevailing price of votes used to be two dollars, women sell their votes for one dollar, for fifty cnts, for a dress pattern, or even a box of candy.

Women are now treated with great deference by man-made laws, and this condition will remain for many after suffrage is granted them. It will probably be fifty years before anything like the full effects will be seen. But in a few weeks after suffrage is granted we begin to hear the shouts of suffragists, "See the suffrage hasn't hurt you any!" "We told you it wouldn't!"

The secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, a suffragist, estimates that the doubling of an electorate adds at least 50 per cent to the cost of elections. We already have fewer elections than we need because of the expense. The expense of the candidates for the U. S. Senate in 1914 was more than three times as great in suffrage states as in others of the same size.

If women were granted the franchise on equal terms with men, the women would become endowd with a tremendous influence without any proportional responsibility for their ac-

tions. All writers on the science of politics are agreed that influence without any adequate responsibility for actions consequent on this influence is one of the most pernicious qualities of a corrupt government.

Suffragists are fond of claiming that woman suffrage always brings better social legislation, such as laws affecting children, and the helpless and defenseless generally. In Wyoming, where women have voted 49 years, they have the most inadquate child labor law in the United States. Only three states in the Union have no 14 year limit for factory labor, Wyoming, New Mexico, and North Carolina.

Suffragists assume and are constantly saying that the only reason for not enfranchising women is because they are mentally and morally incompetent to vote. Who ever hears of that argument except from suffragists? The only reason many women wish to vote is because they resent this imputation. It would be much nearer the truth to say that women are morally superior to men and we wish them to stay so.

The chief interest of humanity is its children, the future of the race. Woman's part in this is far greater and more fundamental than man's; her experience with children and the family is far more important to the welfare of the race than man's experience in business or politics. If women gave all their time to children, if their homes engrosst all their interests, it would be all too little for such a stupendous responsibility.

Many refuse to see that woman suffrage will not stop with voting, but involves all the questions concerning the relations of the sexes, of the home and children, of feminism, espcially in European countries where the close of the war will leave such an enormous majority of women. What has happened under Bolsheviki control in Russia ought to open the eyes of those who are indifferent to the advance of equal suffrage.

Suffragists say that if women seek office too much they will not be elected; that we can trust the voters for that. That is a characteristically superficial answer. If men vote against women because they are women, women will retaliate. Nothing on earth can prevent sex becoming an issue in politics with a large number of voters; and this can only result in introducing further confusion and distraction into our political life.

Men who favor woman suffrage do not incur the antagonism or hatred of the women who oppose it. But it is very different with men who oppose woman suffrage. When a man frankly expresses his convictions against suffrage the fury of the suf-

fragist knows no bounds. Men are generally willing to let women have their way about things, and a man will not oppose woman suffrage unless he has very strong convictions on the subject.

The bitterness of the fight between the suffragists and the anti-suffragists is of itself an unanswerable argument against woman suffrage. It shows that the entrance of women into politics is going to be accompanied by increast political personalities and bitterness which all good citizens must deplore, and which must always injure the efficiency of a democracy if not threaten its very existence. We have too much of that sort of thing already.

But some women say they do not wish to marry, and that therefore they should be allowed to ssume the privileges and prerogatives of men, should be allowed the freedom of action now allowed by society to men. But because they are willing that the race should perish with this generation, should their wishes and desires be granted at the expense of sacrificing the highest interests of the race? Society must order its affairs to suit the normal rather than the abnormal woman.

Suffragists are fond of dilating on the smallness of the time required for a woman to go to the polls and vote; as if the mere mechanical act of voting was all the time requird. Why don't they expatiate on the time requird to attend political meetings and listen to 3 hour speeches; on the time spent in arguing politics; the time requird to gossip about candidates—things that really take time. We have altogether too much of that sort of thing now, what would it be if women get into politics?

Experience has already provd conclusively that when women get the ballot they immediately want to hold office. Not only unmarried women get the office fever, but married women as well. It is perfectly plain that no woman can hold public office and rear a family of children at the same time. There are doubtless sensible women who would not neglect higher duties to seek office, but the men do not have a monoply of foolishness; there are plenty of women to whom office is as fascinating as it is to men.

The fact that no great genius has yet come from a children's home or from a foundling's asylum shows that the home is needed for the most effective development of children. It is beyond all question the most important institution of the civilized world. Even Lincoln said, "All I am I owe to my mother," and he enjoyd maternal privileges far less than most men. Many

suffragists admit that woman suffrage will not benefit the home, and many openly advocate the rearing of children in homes supported by the state.

It is argued that because women are normally better than men, therefore they should be allowed to vote. It is not at all clear that women are better than men because they do not vote. Most women live a more or less sheltered life, do not come in contact with the sordid influences inseparable from the task of earning a living. And to the great majority of men there is no higher joy than the privilege of laying their lives at the feet of the woman they love. The privilege of sheltering and caring for womanhood is the highest glory of manhood.

It is already true in many states that it is practically impossible for a poor man to successfully run for office, because it requires so much money to get his claims before all the voters. It is evident that woman suffrage must fully double this difficulty; it will more than double it because it will be harder to reach the women. A poor man will have but little chance unless he mortgage himself to some selfish interest who will finance him if he will serve them. Woman suffrage will tend to still more limit office holding to the corrupt or the well-to-do

A suffrage claim is, "It took the mothers of Massachusetts 55 years to get an equal guardianship law, but after women obtained the ballot in Colorado the very next legislature enacted one." The plain implication is that it was the result of woman suffrage. The fact is that the suffragists did not even know that the bill was introduced. Its advocates kept it from them because many of the legislature were opposd to woman suffrage and they feard their opposition if the suffragists championd it. It passt both houses by unanimous vote without the slightest aid from suffragists.

In Denver it is found to be practically impossible to convict women who violate the election laws. The judge who would have the temerity to sentence a woman for such law infraction might as well resign at the end of his term. He would be immediately proscribed, and his sentence would be ascribed to hostility to Woman Suffrage. The consequence is that women of this type vote early and often in the name of their more stay-at-home sisters. It frequently happens that a woman of the better class, when she comes to vote, finds that someone else has already voted in her name.

One of the most shameful acts to the "credit" of woman kind was the act of the suffragetts in picketing the White House.

While President Wilson was overwhelmed with the problems, worries, and burdens leading up to our participation in the Great War, suffragettes were taking turns in nagging, worrying, annoying, and distracting him. Women or any one else capable of such performances are no more capable of voting than many who inhabit our lunatic asylums. Even if woman suffrage were right the suffragists ought to have to wait at least ten years as a punishment for such folly and wickedness.

Women are much more easily influenced by superficial considerations than men. In order to defeat a candidate for any prominent place it is only necessary to insinuate some reflection on his character. Insinuations of this type are as potent as sworn testimony. They cannot be traced to their source and their falsehood made manifest. Even if their falsehood were shown no difference would result. The result is a lower type of candidates, those who are proof against insinuations of this kind, who do not care what is said of them, knowing full well that the worst that can be said would fall short of the truth.

Women need protection not for their own sake only but for the sake of their children, for the sake of the race. The true man sympathizes with women in the burdens nature lays upon her, and since he cannot share them he gladly shields her, and gladly mitigates with love and service her "sorrow and complaint." There is no need of argument to show the truth of this. The care of children, the conservation of the race, necessitate the home refuge from the world struggle. Coarse men and some suffragists may sneer at these sentiments, but their realization brings to all not only the highest joy of life but the highest development

Men have no real objection to Woman Suffrage as such. Their objection consists largely in an instinctive fear of the consequences involved therein. There are differences btween men and women which are necessary and fundamental and generally desirable. If women are physically weaker than men it only means that hers is the finer and more delicate organization. We do not argue that watches are inferior to brick-bats because we do not throw watches at stray cats. Similarly, the fact that women are incapable of successfully performing much of the world's work is no evidence of inferiority, rather the contrary.

Suffragists resent being reminded that socialists, free lovers, pacifists and all such favor woman suffrage. Well, maybe it is a pity but it is nevertheless true. The New York "CALL," a leading socialist paper said the morning after the election November '17, when Woman Suffrage was adopted in New York:

"Socialism and Suffrage, inseparable companions in revolutionary thought and action, have triumphed in the election in New York City and State." Morris Hilquitt, candidate for mayor of New York said, "Socialist propaganda was undoubtedly the most potent factor in the success of the Woman Suffrage Amendment."

Even if women are willing to give up all the legal advantages they now possess would it be best for the race? Humanity is tremendously interested in its women, and depends upon them for all its endowment, its power, its progress. We must consider not only the wishes of women but the interests of the race. For every child a woman must have several years of protection; and with all the protection that man and society can give her she still does more than her share. Because a few masculine, mistaken women desire to sell their birthright for a mess of pottage is not a sufficient reason for permitting it, especially when the great majority of women do not wish it.

Women now enjoy the privileges of women; before the law they have many advantages of men. Now the suffragists want all the rights of men and at the same time keep all their present privileges. It can't be done. Even if man were willing it could not be done. When suffragists change the relations of women to men not even God Almighty could prevent the working out of natural law. The suffragists are trying to sell their birthright for a mess of pottage. Because a few mistaken women, most of them old maids or bossy wives, want to squander the most precious possession of womankind so they can run for office and bask in the limelight, is not a sufficient reason. Woman's privileges are adaptd to her nature and her life work, men's rights are not; at best they are a mighty poor substitute.

In New York in 1915 the majority against woman suffrage was 194,984. In 1917 the majority for it was 102,353. The socialists boast that they did it; the pacifists say they did it. Something else besides woman suffrage must have helpt; such a change as that on the pure merits of the question seems extremely improbable. Maybe there is some truth in the claims of the socialists and pacifists. But suppose there is, are the suffragists in any better company? In November, 1912, Michigan gave a majority against woman suffrage of 732. The following April she gave a majority of 96,144 against it. The change is suspiciously great. Could it be chargd that the liquor element, the crimnal classes generally, and corrupt politicians support

anti-suffrage; and that they were arousd by the smallness of the first majority?

If women are to vote and hold office like the men, then we must change our educational ideals and educate girls to vote and hold office. Instead of becoming well informd in the immense and infinitely important field of domestic science and arts, home nursing and care of the sick which men cannot enter at all, they will wish to study what the boys do. Every girl who took domestic science in a school would be advertising the fact that she wisht to get married, that her ambition was to be a wife and mother insted of a politician. Of course no modest girl would publish such a decision or choice. She would avoid studies she most needs and which public welfare requires that she should study in order to keep from telling the boys that she wishes to get married. It is this modesty which sometimes causes girls to declare that they intend to be old maids when they are already engaged.

Since married women are the only women who can live the fully normal woman's life, and perform the fully normal service to the nation and to the human race, it is clear that the question of suffrage ought to be decided chiefly if not entirely accord to how it affects married women. It might be right, if it were possible, to make some provision for women who never have a chance to marry, but many of them do not use the chances that come to them. There is scarcely a great man in history who has not been refusd by some fool woman,—we are under no obligation to provide for such. It is absolutely clear that married women are not so situated that they can use the suffrage and office holding and all that it entails to advantage either to themselves or to their children. If you say, "Oh we don't expect mothers with children to run for office." Then why tempt them to do it? If you don't expect them to make full and normal use of the suffrage, why give it to them?

OPINIONS

John Bright: He once voted for woman suffrage but after due reflection said, "I do not believe that woman suffer by not being represented in Parliament, and I do not believe it would be an advantage to them if they were so represented."

Herbert Spencer: After advocating woman suffrage for many years said, that he discovered mental and emotional dif-

ferences between the sexes which disqualify women for the burdens of government and the exercise of its functions.

Bishop John H. Vinicent: "When about 30 years of age I accepted for a time the doctrines of woman suffrage and publicly defended it. Years of wide and careful observation have convinct me that the demand for woman suffrage in America is without foundation in equity, and, if successful, must prove harmful to American society.

"I find some worthy women defending it, but the majority of our best women, especially our most intelligent, domestic, and godly mothers neither ask for or desire it. The instinct of motherhood is against it. The basal conviction of our best manhood is against it. The movement is at root a protest against the representative relations and functions by virtue of which each sex depends upon the other and is exalted by the other. This theory and policy tending to the subversion of the natural and divine order must make a man less a man and woman less a woman.

"A distinguisht advocate of this suffrage movement says, "We need the ballot to protect us against men." When one sex is thus compeld to protect itself against the other, the foundations of society are already crumbling. Woman now makes man what he is. She controls him as a babe, boy, manly son, brother, lover, husband, father. Her influence is enormous. If she use it wisely she needs no additional power. If she abuse her opportunity she deserves no additional responsibility. Her womanly weight now without measure, will be limited to the value of a single ballot and her control over from two to five additional votes forfeited.

"The curse of America today is the dominated partisan vote—the vote of ignorance and superstition. Shall we help matters by doubling this dangerous mass? Free from the direct complications and passions of the political arena, the best women may exert a conservative and moral influence over men as voters. Force her into the same bad atmosphere, and both man and woman must inevitably suffer incalcuable loss. We know what woman can be in the "commune" in "riots" and on the "rostrum."

"Woman can, thru the votes of men, have every right to which she is entitled. All she has man has gladly given her. It is his glory to represent her. To rob him of this right is to weaken both. He and she are just now in danger thru his mistaken courtesy."

Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt: "If our constitution prevents

our enfranchisement, I say, let us tear it into shreds and make a new one. Our cause can wait no longer. We must train our guns on Congress, upon the South; We must train them even upon some members of our own organization, for we want freedom by Federal amendment—and we want it now."

Kate Douglas Wiggin: "I would not for the world retard the development of woman nor hamper in her struggle for still greater freedom than she now possesses, tho to my mind she has not at any time gone to the limit of her powers under present conditions, but I cannot believe that the ballot is the first or the next or the best thing to work for. I want her to be a good home-maker, a good mother, and a loyal, intelligent, active citizen, but above all to be a helpful stimulating, inspiring force in the world rather than a useful and influential factor in politics. * * * It is even more difficult to be an inspiring woman than a good citizen and an honest voter and if you declare your ability to be all three I shall continue to believe that the first of the three will continually be lost in the development of the other two."

Judge Ben Lindsey: "The women are as free of the power of the beast as the men and no freer. Their leaders in politics are politicians. Women in politics are human beings * * * and they are unable to free us because they are not free themselves."

Mrs. R. C. Campbell: (Colorado State Board for the Care of Dependent Children) "We did believe of course in our hearts that women in public life would purify politics and would make for a higher moral and political standard. After 20 years (of suffrage) we are forced to admit that human nature as displayed by women is not different from that displayed by men, and if the appeal had been made on the ground of uplift in politics it would have been disprovd by the facts."

Judge W. H. Snell: (Tacoma, Wash.) "I favored woman suffrage in Washington and voted for it. But * * * I am so greatly disappointed at the way it has workt out that I would today welcome an opportunity to vote for its withdrawal."

Mrs. Francis W. Goddard: (Colorado) "For years I believed in woman suffrage, and have workt day in and day out for it. I now see my mistake * * * . The experiment is a failure. It has done Colorado no good. The best thing for both would be if tomorrow the ballot for women could be abolisht."

Miss Annie Bock: (Los Angeles, Calif.) "I gave without remuneration over a year of my life, working for suffrage. If I

had it to do over again I would work twice as hard, if it were possible, against it, * * * . I have had more than ordinary opportunity to observe and watch the workings of suffrage, and I consider the result not only unsatisfactory and disappointing, but disastrous."

Ida M. Tarbell: (Introduction to Book of Woman's Power) "The assumption that the improvement in woman's position depends on the vote is quite as unsound as the charge of her inferiority. Sixty years ago it was held that the only road to the broad and full plan of education which the new democratic scheme made imperative, was the ballot, but that scheme has been realized to the full without a single woman's vote. * * * It has not taken a vote of hers to set professional doors ajar, and they will surely swing further open, ballot or no ballot. Undoubtedly the argument for suffrage which today causes most hesitation among the thoughtful and sympathetic who are not convinct of the wisdom of extending suffrage to women, is that fair conditions and wages for the great body of women in industry can only be realized by giving them the suffrage, that they need it for self-protection. The rapid advance which protective legislation for women and children is making, the absolute certainty that it will soon be as perfect as has been conceivd and will be improvd as rapidly as it is learned how to improve it, the absolute certainty that wages depend not on votes but on economic laws, are best answers to this. The woman in industry is after all but a transient—her working life averaging but a few years. She graduates from shop or factory to real life. * * *

A harmful and unsound implication in the suffrage argument has been that woman's position in society would improve in proportion as her activities and interests became the same as those of men. This implies of course that man's work in society is more important and developing than woman's. But both are essential to society, and who can prove that one essential factor is superior to another essential factor? * * * As for a woman developing more perfectly under masculine conditions, all the laws of growth are against it. Her aptitudes and instincts and functions are different. * * * Her differences are her strength * * * To suppress these differences is to rob not merely her individual life but the life of the world of its full ripeness.

There is grave need in this country especially of lifting the suffrage debate from the narrow lines it has followd, stripping it of false assumptions and of impossible claims, and centering

it about a woman more nearly typical than the melancholly figure which has so far servd it. * * * She is no longer askt to prove her equality (with man) by doing in his way the things he does. She proves it by doing the things for which she is fitted and which the world needs from her."

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 061901804

DEBATE BULL

These are collections of facts and arguments on both sides of public questions. While efforts are made to secure accuracy in statements of facts, none is made to test the soundness of arguments; they are simply arguments which are used. The debator himself needs the discipline of testing arguments. A brief description of these bulletins are given below:

Number 12. **A Students' Manual of Debating and Parliamentary Practice.** This is a reprint with a few changes of three bulletins of the University of Wisconsin. It contains, (1) Suggestions for organization, with a Model Constitution; (2) A brief Manual of Parliamentary Practice; (3) A brief Manual of Argumentation; (4) Instructions to Judges. Sold at 10c per copy.

Number 13. **The Initiative and Referendum.** Giving several articles and digests of a number of others. (Out)

Number 15. **Unicameral Legislatures.** 72 pp. Same plan.

Number 16. **Guaranty of Bank Deposits.** 80 pages. (Out)

Number 17. **Woman Suffrage.** 80 pages. (Out)

Number 18. **Consolidation of Rural Schools.** 32 pages.

Number 20. **The Preferential Ballot.** 56 pages.

Number 22. **Government Ownership of Railways.** 116 pp.

Number 22. **The Single Tax.** 162 pages.

Number 24. **Workmen's Compensation.** 132 pages.

Number 26. **Selling Munitions of War.** 64 pages.

Number 28. **Continuing the Monroe Doctrine.** 148 pages.

Number 30. **Teachers' Pensions.** 52 pages.

Number 34. **Compulsory Arbitration of Labor Disputes.**

Number 40. **Woman Suffrage No. 2.** 80 pages.

Others in preparation.

All these bulletins except Number 12, are furnished free to any citizen of the state.

It is desirable that each debating club should have more than one copy of each bulletin, at least one for each debator. We will send whatever number will be actually used. Address all requests to

THE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION DIVISION
Department of Public Discussion and Debate
Norman, Oklahoma